





UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES

Estate of Solomon Katz

The
HISTORIAN EPHORUS

LONDON
Cambridge University Press
FETTER LANE

NEW YORK • TORONTO
BOMBAY • CALCUTTA • MADRAS
Macmillan

TOKYO
Maruzen Company Ltd

All rights reserved

The
HISTORIAN EPHORUS

BY
G. L. BARBER, M.A.

THE PRINCE CONSORT PRIZE ESSAY 1934

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1935

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> vij
<i>Chapter I.</i> Ephorus' life and works	i
II. The contents of the Histories	17
III. The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia	49
IV. The Prefaces	68
V. The influence of Isocrates	75
VI. Bias in Ephorus	84
VII. The causes of the Peloponnesian War	106
VIII. The sources of the Histories	113
IX. Some criticisms of Ephorus	138
Conclusion	154
Appendices	160
<i>Bibliography</i>	188

PREFACE

THE discussion of Ephorus began more than a century ago with Marx's publication of the fragments (1815), and attention was paid at intervals throughout the nineteenth century to one aspect or another of his work. The framework, however, established by Marx was too insecure, and little progress was made until Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* appeared. This collection formed the starting-point for the resumption of the study of Ephorus; but since a large part of our knowledge of him depends on the use of the Histories by later writers, it was inevitable that the ground should be cleared in this direction before any attempt was made to estimate his importance. Thus Volquardsen established the fact that he was Diodorus' authority in XI-XVI, with the exception of most of the Sicilian narrative: Adolf Bauer dealt with the part Ephorus played in the transmission of Herodotus into the pages of Diodorus: and Holzapfel supported Volquardsen's argument for Diodorus' use of Ephorus by tracing the general similarity of the former's narrative with Thucydides for the period 479-413, and showing that its deviations were due to a pro-Athenian standpoint. Other writers were concerned with Ephorus as a geographer, or had attempted, on the basis of Müller's work, to determine the contents and arrangement of the Histories, or had developed in specialised and detailed articles, which had particular reference to Ephorus

PREFACE

through Strabo, the early history of the Greek states. Further, the connection between Ephorus and writers other than Diodorus was examined. Among contributors to this sphere of investigation may be noted Melber and Wolffgarten: the former established the use of the Histories in the early books of Polyænus, while the latter's sweeping generalisations on their appearance in Justin's abridgment of Pompeius Trogus have been reconsidered and partially accepted by Holzapfel.

The study of Ephorus proceeded on this system, and a number of separate aspects of his work were examined. The most important result was his acceptance as Diodorus' source for Greek events in xi-xvi; and it is believed that Diodorus used him for the account of the Athenian expeditions to Sicily. It has been assumed for the purposes of the present dissertation that no further proof of this is needed.¹ Moreover, the problem of the use of Ephorus by later writers both Greek and Roman has only been dealt with in so far as it is concerned with the investigation of the Histories, and the inquiry has not been pursued beyond a scrutiny of the arguments already advanced. Although most of the ground has been covered, there is still room for research, particularly in the cases of Plutarch, Pausanias and Nepos.

By the end of the nineteenth century the time was ripe

¹ V. Schwartz. P.W. "Diodorus", v. 1, col. 663; and *F.G.H.* II c, pp. 33-34. The study of Ephorus seems to show that Diodorus made a partial use of him in vii-ix as well. V. pp. 118, n. 2, 133, n. 1, and 145, n. 1; cf. Oxy. Pap. 1365 with Diod. viii. 24. The close similarity of Diodorus' narrative with Ephorus is well illustrated by a comparison of Oxy. Pap. 1610 (Grenfell and Hunt, XIII) with the text of Diod. xi. 59-62. See Appendix I for a discussion of the sources of Diodorus' Sicilian history.

PREFACE

for a comprehensive survey and assessment of Ephorus' work. Busolt and Blass had already provided useful summaries which had gathered together a number of rather disconnected threads; but each of them necessarily produced a synopsis of the discoveries of previous scholars, which had not the merit of a full picture. In any case, Müller's collection of the fragments was not complete.

It happened that in 1906 the fragments of an unknown historian were discovered at Oxyrhynchus. Grenfell and Hunt's publication was the cause of a storm of controversy on the authorship of the papyrus, which centred round the names of Theopompus, Ephorus, and for want of a better claimant, Cratippus. The two former historians found powerful advocates in E. Meyer and Judeich: and the latter's arguments on behalf of Ephorus were strengthened and enlarged by Dr Walker, whose lectures, published in 1913, present the strongest case that has yet been seen. The storm gradually subsided; and the question has never been satisfactorily settled. It is for this reason that the present writer has reviewed in Chapter III the evidence put forward in support of Ephorus. Clearly, if it could be established that he is the author of the papyrus, some of the accepted opinions of his ability would have to be revised—to the further discredit of Diodorus. It will be seen, however, that his claims must be abandoned, a decision which agrees with Jacoby's recent article in which he seeks to substitute the Boeotian historian Daimachus.¹ But the question of a

¹ *V. Nachr. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen*, 1924, I. p. 13 sq. Jacoby's plea for Daimachus is not altogether convincing (p. 18); Ephorus

PREFACE

successor to Theopompus or Ephorus has no concern for our present purpose: it is sufficient that the latter cannot be regarded as the author. Nevertheless, the discussion of the whole problem has a useful bearing on our investigation of the Histories.

Shortly before Grenfell and Hunt published the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, an article by E. Schwartz appeared in volume VI of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*. While it is the *locus classicus* for modern criticism of Ephorus, it took an unnecessarily harsh view of his abilities, and several of its generalisations have had to be rejected. Since Schwartz's time, apart from the controversy mentioned above, Ephorus has not received much consideration. Articles in *Hermes* on his date and the construction of the Histories are referred to elsewhere; in 1913 Kalischek upheld the tradition of Ephorus as the pupil of Isocrates and made that the basis of a minute discussion of his style; there have also been references in periodicals to particular fragments. It was not until 1923 that a work appeared which placed the study of the historian on a new footing. The publication of Jacoby's collection of the fragments which began in that year added to and corrected Müller's edition on many points: its detailed and learned commentary invited a re-examination of previous views and a fresh assessment of Ephorus' importance. The present work

was well acquainted with Boeotian history: Daimachus, whom he is said to have used, was a Boeotian historian: P also shows a close knowledge of Boeotia. Therefore Daimachus is the author of the papyrus. But he might equally well be one of the Boeotian historians, Anaxis or Dionysodorus, mentioned by Diodorus, xv. 95, 4. See also p. 67, note 2.

PREFACE

was undertaken on the assumption that Jacoby's arrangement of the fragments is correct, and the writer has discovered no reason to change his opinion in the course of his investigations. It is significant that Jacoby has seen fit to reverse some of Schwartz's more sweeping judgments. The collection, which includes all ascertainable references to Ephorus by name in classical literature, renders the consultation of Müller's work unnecessary. In addition there are two fragments from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri which have been assigned to Ephorus chiefly because of their close resemblance to Diodorus.¹ It would seem that, with these two exceptions, there are no other references in papyri. The one further instance, quoted in the *Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum* (no. 114, p. 88), has been ascribed to Ephorus' account of the Cretan constitution; but it must be admitted that there is not enough evidence to make this identification certain.²

From the foregoing paragraphs it is evident that the study of Ephorus has been confined entirely to the labours of German scholars, whose verdicts range from Niebuhr's over-indulgent estimate of his critical capacity to Wilamowitz's contempt for "an enlightened Philistine".³ No work has been produced in this country

¹ Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*, nos. 2 and 3. The latter is Oxy. Pap. 1610 (Grenfell and Hunt, XII), which is also included in Jacoby's fragments.

² *V. Revue de Philologie*, XXI. pp. 1-4 and 8-10, where the authorship is left uncertain.

³ Niebuhr, *Vorles. ü. a. Gesch.* v. p. 409: "er war ein höchst wahrhafter Mann, und hatte historisches Talent zur Kritik... bei dem die Geschichte als wissenschaftliche Disciplin erscheint." Cf. Wilamowitz, *Greek Historical Writing*, p. 20.

PREFACE

which has dealt specifically with Ephorus as an historian.¹ Allusions to particular points have been made in periodicals; for example in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, he is mentioned in Professor Myres' article on the History of the Pelasgian Theory, and references have been made to him as the source of Nepos' account of Marathon and Paros, and in connection with excavations at Miletus where late Mycenaean houses are perhaps to be identified with Ephorus' πρώτον κτίσμα Κρητικόν.² In recognition, therefore, of this deficiency and in the belief that Jacoby's publication makes fresh investigation necessary, the present writer has attempted a survey of the Histories and an assessment of Ephorus' value as an historian.

I am grateful to Professor F. E. Adcock, M.A., who has kindly made a number of suggestions since the award of the prize, and to Mr H. C. Oakley, M.A., for his diligent help with the proofs.

G. L. B.

June 1935

¹ Bury (*Ancient Greek Historians*) disposes of Ephorus in three pages, 162-164.

² *V. J.H.S.* xxviii. pp. 209-213; xxxix. pp. 48-61 and xl. pp. 42-46; *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1908, p. 17.

CHAPTER I

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

NO remark could be more concise or depressing than the introductory sentence of Jacoby's commentary;¹ for it throws the investigator back upon an entangled web of references from classical authors, who were all equally convinced of the rather simple facts: that Ephorus, whose parentage was unknown, came from the town of Cyme in Asia Minor, was a pupil of Isocrates, and very probably a contemporary, even at Isocrates' school, of Theopompus: and that he had a son, Demophilus, who completed his unfinished work. Apart from these facts not a single detail of his life is known or so far discoverable: the dates of his birth and death, as far as direct evidence is concerned, are shrouded in obscurity: and even his *floruit*, owing to the different interpretations of a passage of Suidas, is the cause of much disagreement. The most that can be said with absolute certainty is that he lived and wrote in the fourth century; that his reputation as an historian soon became firmly established, and that his works were read and their value recognised at least until the second century A.D. Thereafter, apart from his use by Stephanus of Byzantium, he was merely remembered as a contributor to the spate of historical writing which accompanied the disruption of the Greek world in the fourth century.

¹ "Biographische Überlieferung scheint ganz gefehlt zu haben."

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Of the few facts known to us, the passage of Suidas and the question of Ephorus' relationship to Isocrates and Theopompus have chiefly engaged the attention of modern commentators. The manifest confusion of the interrelated notices of Suidas on Ephorus and Theopompus proves that his only concern was to uphold the theory that they were contemporaries.¹ Among the various ways of evading the difficulty the most probable appears to have been proposed by Marx in his collection of the fragments. He suggests 408-405 as a suitable time for Ephorus' birth, and the beginning of Philip's reign for his *floruit*. Klügmann,² who has a useful discussion of this problem, finds that Marx's suggestion tallies with a quotation of Eudocia's—ἦν Ἐφορος ἐπὶ τῆς γγ' Ὀλυμπιάδος—which dates his *floruit* as 368-365, a date which is supported by two further facts: Isocrates did not open his school at Athens until 392; and Ephorus was still actively engaged on the last part of his history after Alexander's accession. It is therefore unlikely that he was old enough to attend Isocrates' lectures before the

¹ V. Suid. s. Ἐφιππος: . . . Κυμαῖος, υἱὸς Δημοφίλου, οἱ δὲ Ἀντιόχου· Ἰσοκράτους ἀκουστής. . . ἱστορικός. . . ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἑνεηκοστῆς τρίτης Ὀλυμπιάδος (408-405), ὡς καὶ πρὸ τῆς Φιλίππου βασιλείας εἶναι τοῦ Μακεδόνα· and s. Θεόπομπος· γεγυνώς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὴν ἀναρχίαν Ἀθηναίων (404-403), ἐπὶ τῆς ἑνεηκοστῆς τρίτης Ὀλυμπιάδος, ὅτε καὶ Ἐφορος. If ἦν = *floruit*, as it normally does, the absurdity of making Ephorus a pupil of Isocrates is patent. Moreover, Ephorus was still writing c. 330 (v. p. 13). Both Jacoby and Schwartz (P.W. "Eph." col. 1) dismiss this information as worthless.

² *De Eph. hist. Graeco*. Klügmann, who gives Müller's explanation of Suidas' mistake, whereby he refers (wrongly) the time of anarchy to the period between the reigns of Amyntas and Philip, agrees that the most important part of Ephorus' life was passed in the reign of Philip.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

latter date.¹ Thus the hypothesis that he lived *c.* 405–330 seems a reasonable one to adopt.

Jacoby's thorough investigation of classical texts has disclosed the unanimity of opinion on the relationship between Ephorus and Isocrates;² and it is somewhat surprising to find how sceptical certain modern critics have been of this strong tradition. The most destructive attack is contained in Schwartz's article in *Pauly-Wissowa*.³ He maintains that to describe a writer as Ἰσοκράτικός is merely a means of classification; and the traditional view of Ephorus and Theopompus as disciples of Isocrates is only the crystallisation of the verdict of antiquity on the characteristics of their styles. Embellishments of the legend were easily invented: thus came about the famous saying of Isocrates that Theopompus needed the rein, and Ephorus the spur;⁴ and a further absurd accretion to the story was the report that he advised Ephorus, Theopompus and Xenophon to write history.⁵ Clearly, as far as Xenophon is concerned, nothing could be further from the truth; and one is tempted to believe that one misstatement only conceals

¹ Kalischek, *De Ephoro et Theopompo Isocratis Discipulis*, pp. 14–15. The story that Ephorus' father sent him back to Isocrates as an unprofitable scholar shows that he attended the school as a youth. It does not, however, sound authentic enough to be used as evidence (*F.G.H.* T. 4).

² *F.G.H.* T. 1–34 *passim*. There are no less than eighteen references.

³ "Eph." cols. 1–2. Schwartz was not so decided in his opinions two years earlier, *Hermes*, XLIV. p. 481 sq.

⁴ *F.G.H.* T. 28.

⁵ *Phot. bibl.* 260, p. 486 b, 36: γεγόνاسι δ' αὐτοῦ ἀκροαταὶ Ξενοφῶν... Θεόπομπος... Ἐφορος... οἷς καὶ ταῖς ἱστορικαῖς συγγραφαῖς προὔτρεμματο χρήσασθαι.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

another. At the same time, the path of scepticism runs downhill, and the wise critic takes stock of his position at frequent intervals. Before annihilating the traditional account, Schwartz might well have considered its widespread diffusion in antiquity. Admittedly, Diodorus, Strabo, Cicero and even Quintilian may not have been over-critical in their acceptance of it; but that they did accept it is not lightly to be disregarded. When it becomes evident that Ephorus sometimes reflected Isocrates' opinions,¹ and perhaps even drew the basic principles of his history from the master's inspiration, and when, further, Volquardsen,² while investigating Diodorus' sources, found frequent parallelism of language and ideas between his narrative and Isocrates', however much we may wish to discount the value of such uncritical evidence, we cannot but agree that the tradition has a firmer foundation than appears at first sight, and cannot justifiably be neglected.³

From the rather tenuous discussion of Ephorus' life we must now turn to him as an historian. Our picture, however, will not be complete without a brief consideration of his other less important works. Two of them are certainly typical of the man and his age: the Ἑπὶ χόριος Λόγος, and the treatise Περὶ Λέξεως. The former represents a type of literature which was very common from

¹ See Chapter v and Kalischek, *op. cit.* pp. 8-10.

² *Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor*, pp. 49-51.

³ Jacoby comes to the same conclusion (*F.G.H.* II c, p. 22, line 41): "nur spricht bei Ephoros nichts gegen und manches für die Richtigkeit der persönlichen Verbindung." See also for the same point of view Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I. p. 149.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

the fifth century until the comparative independence of the Greek world was submerged by the influence of a greater power: when, apart from the feeling of kinship which far-sighted politicians sought to instil into the Greek-speaking peoples, the tiny city-states in their geographically watertight compartments vied with one another for the trifling distinction of greater antiquity or more famous stock. It was inevitable that the more insignificant a city was, the more unscrupulous it might become in inventing its own reputation; and writers were never lacking who were prepared to discover some connection between the heroes of the past and their own birthplace. Thus Ephorus had the temerity to claim that both Homer and Hesiod were of Cymeian origin:¹ and no better example than this is needed to prove that annals such as these were not an accurate record of local history, but a chronicle more often than not deliberately forged to promote the fame of one's native city.² The passage quoted shows that Ephorus must be regarded as yet another contributor to the heap of controversial literature on the Homeric question: doubtless other towns made similar claims which, happily, have long been forgotten.

The *Περὶ Λέξεως* was a treatise on style. It is a production such as we should expect from a disciple of Isocrates. Whether Schwartz is right or not in his

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 1 n. Note Ephorus' explanation, and appropriation, of the name Ὅμηρος: οὕτω γὰρ ἐκάλουν οἱ τε Κυμαῖοι καὶ οἱ Ἴωνες τοὺς τὰς ὁπείς πεπηρωμένους παρὰ τὸ δεῖσθαι τῶν ὁμηρευσόντων, ὃ ἐστὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων. That Ephorus was not the first to make Homer a Cymeian, see von Christ, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* 1. p. 88, 2 n.

² Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 2: "Panegyrische Zusammenstellung der vaterstädtischen Tradition."

assumption that Isocrates did not touch on such theoretical discussions it is impossible to say; but it is difficult to imagine how a man, who professed to teach the art of speaking or writing on large political subjects (ἡ τῶν λόγων παιδεία), whose speeches themselves were monuments of stylistic ability, and whose prose was remembered by literary critics for its rhythmical, periodic structure, could fail to have discussed with his pupils the basic principles of composition.¹ The three extant passages (F. 6, 107 and 108) are of very little value, and are too obscure to tell us much of Ephorus' views. The only point of any importance is the reference to the avoidance of verse-rhythm in prose;² an illustration of how widespread the recognition was of the principle so neatly formulated by Aristotle—ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μὴ (*Rhet.* III. 8).

Among the other works rightly or wrongly attributed to Ephorus by Suidas are two books *Περὶ Εὐρημάτων*.³ Their few extant fragments are sufficient indication of their contents (F. 2-5, 104-106), which ranged from a discussion of the Phoenician introduction of the alphabet to accounts of the origin of the Orphic mysteries in Phrygia. The title of this work of Ephorus shows its relation to the literature of his period: it is an example of the textbook intended to popularise knowledge. Since

¹ Dion. Hal. *Isocrates*, 2: περιόδῳ τε καὶ κύκλῳ περιλαμβάνειν τὰ νοήματα πειρᾶται ῥυθμοειδεῖ.

² *F.G.H.* F. 6. Ephorus himself opened the passage in question with a scazon: πάλιν δὲ περὶ τῆς ἐν ῥυθμῷ διέξειμι.

³ Suid. s. Ἐφίππος: ἔγραψεν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου ποροθήσεως καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν μέχρι τῶν αὐτοῦ χρόνων βιβλία λ. Περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν βιβλία κδ. Παραδόξων τῶν ἑκαστοῦ βιβλία ιε. Εὐρημάτων ὧν ἕκαστος εὖρε βιβλία β. καὶ λοιπά.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

the time of Hippias of Elis one branch of sophistry had concerned itself, at his instigation, with giving popular instruction on literature, science, and art as the basis of a higher mental discipline. The sophists recognised the utility of such books as these with their wide variety of topics for the promotion of education, and probably the demand for them was comparatively large. Sometimes the authors fell out and rival theories arose: such is the explanation of Pliny's remark (T. 33)—Stratone qui contra Ephori Εὐρήματα scripsit.¹ However, they are of little value for our present purpose except as an example of Ephorus' versatility and the interest in antiquities which was a marked feature of his historical work.

Nothing whatsoever has survived of the other books mentioned by Suidas, in spite of their size; and the way is now clear for an examination of the work with which Ephorus' name is always associated. The Histories were his title to fame in the eyes of posterity, and it is to the general discussion of the questions associated with their composition that we must now turn.

When did Ephorus write his history? Did he publish each volume separately, and did he write them all in chronological sequence, beginning with the Return of the Heracleidae? These problems have attracted considerable attention in the past, and not least among those who have had occasion to investigate the authorship of the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia; and in this respect there has

¹ This reference, incidentally, proves that the "Discoveries" were not a part of Ephorus' history, as was formerly supposed. (*F.G.H.* F. 2-5 n.)

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

been a very noticeable tendency to distort plain statements of fact such as we find in Diodorus to support or destroy arguments more or less ingeniously advanced on Ephorus' behalf. Jacoby's impartial introduction to his commentary on the fragments has removed some of the dust of conflict, and has cleared the path for fresh investigation. In addition, to anticipate a later chapter, the partial settlement of the dispute on the authorship of the papyrus and the consequent abandonment of Ephorus' claims have removed an obstacle which has done more than anything else to pervert the few conclusions that can be drawn from the small quantity of extant evidence.

The first is the most important of the three questions we have asked above: for on the answer to this depend to a large extent the answers to the others. Let us therefore examine the available evidence. There are three passages which need to be considered, although, unfortunately, they are not of particularly good authority. Clement of Alexandria (F. 223) gives a list of historians and quotes the number of years each had allowed between the Return of the Heracleidae and the crossing of Alexander into Asia; Ephorus, according to him, put the number at 735; secondly, Tertullian (F. 217) attributes to Ephorus the well-known story of Philip's dream and its significance for the greatness of his son; thirdly, Plutarch (*de stoic. repug.* 20) mentions Ephorus amongst those who refused Alexander's invitation to his court. Clearly these references tell us little. Clement's list is naturally suspect, if only for the remarkable coincidence that no less than five historians reckoned the Return of the Heracleidae from one and the same era: moreover,

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

as Dr Walker has shown,¹ Clement's statement conflicts with Diodorus, who, without any reference to the *διάβασις*, states that Ephorus included about 750 years in his work, down to the siege of Perinthus. Since Diodorus' chronological source is found to be correct in the majority of instances, there need be no hesitation in preferring his figures to those of Clement. Further, Tertullian's story, as both Dr Walker and Jacoby admit, is so clearly a *vaticinium ex eventu*, which could not have originated until Alexander's fame was established, that it is of little importance: it could only have been inserted in a history of Philip's reign in connection with the birth of Alexander; but since there is no trace of it in Diodorus' narrative of this period (*c.* 356), presumably it was not to be discovered in his authority. Surely Diodorus' flair for the extraordinary would not have forsaken him here.² Finally Plutarch's account savours of the legendary and indiscriminate collection of learned men at a great court.³ The sole implication of these passages is that Ephorus lived to see the accession of Alexander: to strain it further, as Niese has done (*Hermes*, XLIV. pp. 176, 177), into an attempt to prove that the historian outlived the king, and even wrote his whole work after his death, is presumptuous: Ephorus must have been getting old, and the production *in toto* of a world-history would be a physical impossibility.

Further evidence, however, from Diodorus lessens the

¹ *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, p. 86.

² *V.* p. 121.

³ Schwartz, *Hermes*, XLIV. p. 491, remarks apropos of this that the story merely proves that Ephorus had made his reputation as an historian.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

indecisive nature of these quotations. There are several passages which seem to have been written with foreknowledge of the future. For instance, in xv. 88, at the close of his encomium on Epaminondas, he remarks on the loss of Thebes' supremacy and distinctly hints at the destruction of the city nearly thirty years later. Again, in the preface to xvi, before embarking on the long story of Philip's reign, he touches on the armaments he was to collect against Persia, and the fact that not he himself but his son was destined to use them.¹ Of course, these remarks may spring from Diodorus himself, but it is more than likely, especially in the case of the preface, that they were due to the inspiration of Ephorus. In that case, the composition of the last books of the *Histories* took place under Alexander. In fact, since the reference to Alexander's destruction of Thebes occurs in connection with the battle of Mantinea, the composition of book xxv must be later than 335. The importance of this will be realised shortly. It will appear later that Ephorus' work was cut short by his death, at a time when he had recorded the siege of Perinthus (341).² At the most,

¹ Similarly xvi. 14; but xvi. 56 and 64, although they contain references to Alexander's time, were not taken from Ephorus' work, but from his son's.

² Whether it was his intention to terminate his history in 341 or with the *διάβρογς* cannot be determined. Perhaps, because Diodorus knew nothing of the latter point as a conclusion, and because his figures (750) are divisible into twenty-five generations (T. 10)—if the usual computation of thirty years for a generation is accepted (*v.* Appendix II)—we are right in believing that Ephorus did not intend to end his work with Alexander's crossing into Asia. After all, Diodorus, in stating that Demophilus completed his father's work (T. 9), does imply that he only added to it an account of the Sacred War.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

therefore, it can be said that he was still at work after Philip's death; a conclusion which proves to be in conformity with the views of most modern critics, in particular of Jacoby and Kalischek.¹

We now come to the discussion of the time when Ephorus started to write. Again there are several pieces of internal evidence upon which an opinion may be formed. Fragment 37, which definitely belongs to the fourth book of the Histories, contains a valuable piece of information. Ephorus, after discussing, probably in a geographical connection, the town of Dato in Thrace, adds as it were in a footnote that after its capture by Philip, its name was changed to Philippi. Although the reference to this change of name cannot as quoted by Harpocration be assigned with certainty to IV, it is at least very probable that it should be so connected. In that case it is impossible to avoid the inference that Ephorus wrote this passage after Philip's campaigns in

¹ *F.G.H.* II c, pp. 24-25. Kalischek, *op. cit.* pp. 13-15: p. 14 has a useful note, almost a bibliography, on this point. Both Laqueur (*Hermes*, XLVI. p. 336) and Niese (*Hermes*, XLIV. p. 170) support this; also Gercke und Norden, *Einleitung in der Altertumswissenschaft*, III. p. 106, and Blass (uncritically), *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, II. p. 398. For another view see Schwartz, *Hermes*, XLIV. p. 481 sq., who, in a reply to an article by Niese ("Wann hat Ephoros sein Geschichtswerk geschrieben?") in the same issue of the journal, even denied that Ephorus lived much beyond 357, when his narrative broke off before the Sacred War. Dr Walker makes this one of the corner-stones of his argument in his lectures on the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia. However, Schwartz's argument carries little weight, because it takes no account of Diodorus' statement that Ephorus carried his history down to the siege of Perinthus. Neither Ephorus nor Demophilus chose this rather pointless conclusion to a great work, but the former was prevented by fate from getting beyond it.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Thrace in 356: in other words, book IV was not composed until after this date.

A second and similar case arises in connection with a passage from Strabo which almost certainly was excerpted from II (F. 119). Here, in a generalisation intended to explain the failure of Boeotia to become a great power, although it could produce great men, Ephorus inserts the tell-tale phrase καθάπερ Ἐπομεινώνδης ἔδειξε. At once it becomes clear that the author had lived through the supremacy of Thebes and seen her downfall: the year 361 is the earliest occasion on which such a remark could have been made. The second book, therefore, was not written before that time. On the other hand, it was written before 338; for in F. 121, which belongs to II or III, Ephorus, in speaking of Naupactus, puts it under Locrian control: after 338 it fell into the hands of the Aetolians.¹

By combining the results of the foregoing paragraphs we may get an approximate date for the commencement of the Histories, and an idea of the sequence of their publication. Ephorus' work began after 360 and before 338. If the allusion in IV to Philippi was occasioned by Philip's recent capture of the town, it is a possible assumption that this book appeared c. 356. If a similar argument may be applied in the case of xxv, this book was written c. 334. It is an attractive hypothesis that Ephorus' rate of production was roughly a book a year. Book xxvii—πρόξεις Φιλίππου—had not been fully re-

¹ It is worth noting that the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, which was Ephorus' authority for his eighteenth book, may have been written about 356.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

vised when he died,¹ but xxvi, xxviii, and perhaps xxix, were already finished. If his production remained constant, the date of his death was about 330. The available evidence, therefore, does not seem to justify Niese's conclusion that practically the whole of Ephorus' work was written after Alexander's accession.²

The problem of the date of composition appears to have received a fairly satisfactory solution: only conjectural answers can be given to the other questions of publication and order of production. In dealing with such a large work requiring an extended period of time for its preparation, the simplest method, as in modern times, would be the publication of each book when it was complete.³ It is just possible, since each book began with an elaborate preface, that they were published separately. But there is no evidence that such was the practice of Ephorus' predecessors or contemporaries; for example, Thucydides appears to have been published as a whole, likewise Xenophon's *Anabasis*; and Isocrates expected the reader to make his own subdivisions of a long work.⁴ In Isocrates' recognition of the value of subdivision we may perhaps find the origin of a later separation into books; and it is just possible that Ephorus as a student of Isocrates set the fashion of publication volume by volume. The prefaces are not, like those of Polybius and Xenophon, merely résumés of the pre-

¹ V. p. 40.

² Niese, *op. cit.* p. 178; also *F.G.H.* II c, p. 24, line 39.

³ Nothing is known of the methods of publication; the simplest would be for the publisher to dictate the text to a number of slaves.

⁴ V. Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen*, p. 460. Xenophon's prefaces are rejected in the texts of Hude and Dindorf as later insertions.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

ceding books. They indicate that Ephorus was conscious of very definite subdivisions of his material, but was not concerned with giving the reader a recapitulation to guide him on his way through the Histories. This does not, however, necessarily imply a publication book by book; and on the whole Jacoby's assumption of a production in groups of connected books is the safest and most probable. This assumption in any case underlies and gives meaning to the conclusions reached in the preceding paragraph.¹

It is even more difficult to decide whether the books were written in any sort of chronological sequence.² A writer such as Ephorus, whose chief principle of arrangement was the grouping of related events and the transference of his interest to different parts of the world in separate books, was not bound to adhere to a rigid and consecutive system of production.³ Since, however, Ephorus' work as a whole had to fit into an annalistic framework, and if he realised the necessity of keeping a proportionate interest in the different scenes of his wide landscape, he probably found it easier to write off the more obscure portions first. For, although he despised history when it intruded into the dim hinterland of mythology, and affected to believe that the era of the Heracleidae was a period of verifiable events, experience has shown that the sifting of legends to produce facts is

¹ *F.G.H.* II c, p. 25, line 18: "das grosse Werk partienweise von vielleicht 350 (oder noch etwas später) an erschien"; and Kalischek, *op. cit.* p. 14 n.

² The approximate dating of IV (356) and XXV (334) is not of much help.

³ See next chapter.

EPHORUS' LIFE AND WORKS

undoubtedly a more difficult task than the selection and recording of well-established events. Moreover, as it happened, Ephorus lost his sense of proportion as he drew nearer to his own day: practically half of his history was devoted to a period of time which represented not more than one-twelfth of its whole extent. His inability to control his superabundant detail bears witness to a consecutive system of composition, whereby starting with the earliest and relatively unimportant books he was led in the later volumes to an inevitable, and, from an artistic view-point, unbalanced accumulation of details. To deny that the work as a whole was planned is gratuitous; for it was in the nature of his scheme to select a number of subjects and arrange for their disposition: for example, the geography of Europe (books iv, v), the Persian wars (x), or the reign of Philip (xxvii); but it is beyond the bounds of credibility to believe that in the earlier and more complicated sections of his work he had any idea at all of such well-defined subdivisions.¹ The later consideration of their contents will show how impracticable such a task would have been.

We have drawn, and attempted to maintain and strengthen, the dim outlines bequeathed to us by tradition, but the character of our historian remains obstinately hidden. The man who was Xenophon's contemporary, and possibly his hostile critic,² was at last forgotten; and we are left with the mere compilation of a later writer with which to reconstruct his personality. No doubt, under further scrutiny, some of its features will appear,

¹ See Appendix III.

² *V.* pp. 64, 65.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

but they will constitute the weak points in his armour as an historian rather than the personal characteristics which would be of assistance for the interpretation of his work. We shall see, for example, his misplaced pride in an insignificant little town, or a vague interest in antiquities unaccompanied by a sense of their historical importance. How far Ephorus projected his own shadow on the pages of his work is largely a matter of conjecture; for, when not one single activity of his life is known to us, we cannot, as with Xenophon and Thucydides, form any picture of him, or share in his feelings or his own point of view. In consequence we are deprived of a valuable means of estimating his work, which, although time has dealt so harshly with it, was nevertheless interesting to his contemporaries, if only for the novelty of its execution, and became a standard authority for later historians.

CHAPTER II

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

"Ephorus in his world-history has been successful both in his style and arrangement. Each book embraces events on a subject-system. We have, therefore, chosen this type of subdivision, and shall employ it as consistently as possible. Thus the present book is entitled 'The Islands'." Diod. v. 1, 4.

"Ephorus the first and only man to write a universal history." Polyb. v. 33, 2.

THESE two passages sum up the traditional view of Ephorus' aims and method. They do so briefly, and their writers would seem to have had no hesitation in their own minds as to the precise meaning of the terms "universal" and "subject-system". Polybius goes on to say that many have professed to write histories of the world, without realising the magnitude of their task. They have consequently disposed of the most important affairs in a few chapters, or have been so overwhelmed with the mass of their materials that they have been unable to select with sufficient acumen the most epoch-making events. He implies that Ephorus' attempt was not altogether a failure.

Diodorus raises a thornier problem with his words *κατὰ γένος*. Their meaning is "of the same type or class"; but the difficulty lies in the lack of further definition. Some qualifying clause is really necessary to define the principles on which events are to be collected together.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

As it stands, the phrase can mean almost anything. For example, did Ephorus assign separate books, or at least separate portions of his history, to the different countries of the world? If so, were these accounts chronologically parallel and independent of one another? Then, in the case of two countries such as Greece and Persia, whose interdependence was at times so close that one narrative alone would suffice to give their history, two accounts would inevitably involve either needless repetition or unintelligible gaps at the points where they overlapped. Clearly this is impossible. It is, in fact, absurd to hope to give an intelligible account of the interrelated countries by keeping them separate in watertight compartments. Diodorus did not envisage this when he decided to accept Ephorus as his model. Or does a subject-system imply the grouping together of kindred events entirely irrespective of their date and periods? Jacoby has answered this by showing the impossibility of constructing a coherent narrative combining, in one unit, the Persian Wars of Darius, Xerxes, Agesilaus, and Alexander, and in the next, the Pentecontaetia and the Peloponnesian War. The historian, then, may not press the phrase to its logical conclusion, because his work is meaningless if it disregards entirely an annalistic framework.

What, then, is the point of Diodorus' remark? The question is partly answered by a consideration of Ephorus' books x and xi. It will appear on investigation that the period beginning with the Persian Wars was very probably dealt with in x; in xi Ephorus was concerned with the affairs of the Pentecontaetia.¹ Now to

¹ *V.* pp. 31, 32.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

write off the Persian Wars in one volume (i.e. as a unified subject) and even to combine with them the attack on Sicily is quite feasible, especially if the historian desires to emphasise the dual aspect of the struggle, namely the widespread barbarian attacks on the Greeks of the Mediterranean, and the connection between these attacks in east and west. The division of the Persian Wars into two books which we find in Diodorus does not destroy this unity; for he had to rearrange his material on a chronological system.

Hence we may begin to interpret the phrase in the light of this evidence.¹ Ephorus regarded the Persian Wars as an epoch in the records of mankind—a series of outstanding events whose ramifications were spread throughout the Mediterranean world. As such he treated it, fitting it into the larger framework of his history as the culmination of the growth of the Persian Empire, and the demonstration of the superiority of the Greeks, and in particular of the emergence of Athens as an important power.

However, a more satisfactory solution may be found in a detailed examination of the Histories themselves; for if it proves practicable to reconstruct the outline of

¹ At this point it is advisable to draw a careful distinction in meaning between κοινός and κατὰ γένος, which are both used by Diodorus to describe Ephorus' work. κοινός=universal, relating to the world. This type of history both Diodorus and Ephorus set out to write (Diod. I. 1 sq. and V. 1). But Ephorus also won Diodorus' approval by making a unity of each book, and Diodorus determined to uphold this principle in his history as far as possible. Hence he called his fifth book *Ἡσιωνική*, restricting his narrative solely to the geographical situation and mythology of the world's islands.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

each book, it will be possible to determine the scope of the whole work and to define its subdivisions with some exactness. Such a procedure was adopted as long ago as 1847, when Cauer attempted to assess the contents of some of the books as evidence for Diodorus' sources.¹ He worked on the basis of an early collection of the fragments made by Marx.² But as this has been considerably amplified since Cauer's time, it is hardly surprising that much of his information is now useless. In 1873 Dressler undertook a searching revision of the problem, and while it will be seen that many of his arguments are mistaken, his work has considerable value.³ It is the first and only full analysis of the fragments in existence; but unfortunately there are points, at least in the section dealing with the later books, on which it is now impossible to agree with him: for in recent years several references to Ephorus have been discovered which partly invalidate his conclusions. In 1907 Schwartz enumerated in Pauly-Wissowa those fragments which by their numbers can be definitely assigned to certain books; but he does not make any suggestions to enlarge our knowledge by reference to passages drawn from other authors.⁴ Lastly, Jacoby in the introduction to his commentary on Ephorus devotes

¹ *Quaestionum de fontibus ad Agesilai historiam pertinentibus pars prior.*

² Marx, *M. Ephori Cumaei Fragmenta*, 1815.

³ "Das Geschichtswerk d. Ephorus nach seinen Frg. u. seiner Benutzung durch Diodor." V. also Laqueur, "Die Disposition", *Hermes*, XLVI. p. 321 sq.

⁴ "Eph." col. 4 sq.; see also article in P.W. "Diodorus". It is interesting to note that since Schwartz's time a reference to Eph. XXI has been discovered: v. p. 35.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

several pages to the arrangement. While his account is infinitely more reliable than Dressler's, it is perhaps a little disappointing in its brevity. Jacoby, who dislikes arguments based on probabilities, tends to dismiss somewhat summarily the consideration of certain books, where the materials for deciding upon the contents are rather meagre. On the other hand his conclusions on points which he feels can be finally settled are accurately and concisely set forth.

The method which has hitherto been accepted for determining the scope of the several books is as follows. There are some eighty-six fragments which have been numbered and assigned by the ancient authors who quoted them to definite books. It has been seen that Ephorus may have published each volume as he finished it, at any rate in the later parts of his history; but whether the system of numeration was his own invention or not cannot now be determined. It may have been the work of Alexandrine scholars, upon whose accuracy all later analyses have had to depend. It is fortunate that no startling discrepancies have been discovered in the course of events. In addition, we have numerous passages, as for example in Diodorus and Strabo, which are expressly assigned to Ephorus, although their precise position is not given. Hence, if we accept the numbered fragments as a framework, it is possible to fill it out by inserting these passages according to their probable dates and topics. Moreover, when it is known that Ephorus was Diodorus' source for a given period of history, we get a generalised knowledge of the contents of the former's narrative. The fact that Diodorus' work

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

must be counted as an uncritical compilation facilitates our investigation. Thus, by a system of careful approximation and cross-reference a moderately stable edifice may be built up, giving a clear indication of the length of most of the books, and the outlines of their subject-matter. The general parallelism between Ephorus, Diodorus and Strabo is helpful in settling disputed positions.

The scheme of the thirty books of the *Histories* was an account of the world as a Greek of the fourth century knew it: it included the rise of the Greek states, their activities in the eastern and western Mediterranean, and their relations with the neighbouring kingdoms of Persia, Carthage, Egypt and Macedon. Its *terminus a quo* was the Return of the Heracleidae.¹ Ephorus was led by his contempt for the uncertainties of mythology to omit the customary genealogies and folk-lore; he preferred to regard the Dorian conquest of the Peloponnese as the starting-point of Greek civilisation, and apparently as an era which would stand the test of the search for truth. Thus it is that Diodorus, in the introduction to his fourth book, disparages the "later historians" for their neglect of a difficult subject, with special reference to Ephorus and Callisthenes. How far Ephorus succeeded in keeping to sound historical fact in this early period is a matter which will be discussed in Chapter IX.

The limit of the *Histories*, or at least the limit which Ephorus may have hoped to reach, cannot be ascertained. It will be seen that XXVII terminated with the siege of Perinthus in 341.² There is some reason for believing

¹ V. Appendix II for Ephorus' system of dating.

² V. p. 39.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

that the final draft of this book had not been made, and that Ephorus died without completing his work. We have already observed that he was still writing in Alexander's time; and it seems reasonable from our knowledge of xxvii to assume that at the time of his death he was writing contemporary history. This will account for the increasing wealth of detail as the narrative proceeds (at least in so far as the affairs of Greece are concerned), and also for the fact that the siege of Perinthus is hardly a sufficiently important event to select for the closing-point of an epoch. It must also be remembered that Ephorus undoubtedly omitted the Sacred War. Presumably he regarded it as a subject which deserved separate treatment, in spite of its close connection with Philip. At the same time the improbability that if he had any particular year in view for the end of his work, he should have set this incident aside until the main narrative had terminated, seems to indicate that he did not intend to conclude the Histories in 341. Further, Diodorus, who stated in the preface to xvi that he was allotting that book to the account of Philip's reign from his accession to his death, probably got this idea from Ephorus: in that case xxvii should perhaps have reached the year 336. He omitted the Sacred War because he had quite enough material for one book; and risked the charge of incompetence either by neglecting or repeating Philip's interference in the war in the subsequent volume. Clearly, therefore, the Histories were broken off suddenly, and xxvii probably remained only in outline.

Before we proceed to the detailed examination of the

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

contents of Ephorus' work, two of its characteristics are worthy of notice. First, each book was supplied with a preface.¹ Its purpose was not only to indicate the subject to be treated, but also to give Ephorus an opportunity to moralise, to explain his aims and method, and to indulge in his own personal comments. This practice was apparently so admired by Diodorus that he adopted it in one form or another throughout his history.

Secondly, there is the question whether a title was prefixed to each book or not. In this connection two passages have to be considered.² From the quotations given below it will be seen that iv, which dealt with the geography of Europe, had this name as its title; and that Diodorus, copying what he thought was a usage of Ephorus, wrote the words "The Islands" as the heading of his fifth book. The argument, as Dressler has shown, can easily be carried further.³ For instance in Diodorus xv. 25 we find the words ὁ κληθεὶς Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος ἐνέστη Λακεδαιμονίοις πρὸς Βοιωτούς. It is possible to infer from this that Ephorus xxi was issued under the title ὁ Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος. Similarly from fragment 197 it might be argued that the thirteenth book was called "The Archidamian War",⁴ but this is unlikely since the phrase was unknown not only to Thucydides, but also to Diodorus. Dressler, in fact, quotes from Causer to

¹ Diod. xvi. 76, 5: προοίμιον ἐκάστη προθεῖς.

² Strabo vii. 46 (F.G.H. F. 42): "Εφορος δ' ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ μὲν τῆς ἱστορίας, Εὐρώπῃ δ' ἐπιγραφομένην βίβλῳ. Diod. v. 2 (F.G.H. T. 11): ταύτην τὴν βίβλον ἐπιγράφοντες Νησιωτικὴν.

³ *Op. cit.* pp. 4-6.

⁴ τὰ πρῶτα δέκα ἔτη τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου Ἀρχιδάμειος ἐκλήθη πόλεμος, . . . ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐμβαλεῖν, καθὰ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Ἐφορος καὶ Ἀναξιμένης φασίν. V. F.G.H. F. 197 n.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

illustrate the dangerous extension of this principle. Cauer's enthusiasm led him to formulate out of the general substance of Diodorus xv. 77-89, yet another title, ὁ κατὰ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πόλεμος, which he prefixed to Ephorus xxv. Diodorus, who records in these chapters the dispute between Elis and Arcadia, the destruction of Orchomenos, and the battle of Mantinea, nowhere implies that the phrase "The Peloponnesian War" had been used to describe these events; and the only occasion on which he introduces the actual word "Peloponnese" is in chapter 82 in connection with the struggles which followed the entrance of Sparta and Thebes into the dispute between Elis and Pisa.¹ Undoubtedly in this instance "the wish has proved father to the thought", and Cauer's suggestion is not justified by the text. Perhaps the strongest argument in support of the theory is that Ephorus' method of grouping together related events naturally demanded a title for each section of his work. On the other hand two points must be remembered. When Diodorus used a phrase such as ὁ κληθεὶς Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος, he may have discovered it in his chronological source, and introduced it into his narrative at the appropriate place. Further, out of the numerous references to particular books of the Histories, where we might expect to find a title quoted as well as the number of the book, only one fragment gives both; this is the one we have mentioned above from Strabo. Finally, the fact that Diodorus and Strabo knew of such titles is no proof that they originated with Ephorus himself. On the con-

¹ xv. 82, 4: ἀγῶνες πολλοὶ καὶ μεγάλοι κατὰ τὴν Πελοπόννησον συνέστησαν.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

trary, it is not at all unlikely that they owe their existence to Alexandrine scholars and commentators; for it was in this way that Herodotus' books received their names.

In discussing the contents of the Histories it is proposed to deal with them in two sections: first, the books which are concerned with the history of Greece, Persia and Egypt, and the relations between these countries: secondly, those which are devoted to Sicily. The results of the investigation are given in Appendix III. Necessarily the points of division between most of the books are obscure, and we have to rely to a large extent on a principle implicit in Ephorus' system; namely, the focusing of events around a central theme. In xxv the battle of Mantinea is the climax to Epaminondas' campaigns which have occupied the preceding books, and it will be found to be a very suitable ending. Due regard to this principle combined with a careful handling of all that is quoted from the Histories offers a reconstruction which is at once credible and probable.

I

Of I-v, which served as a general introduction to the whole work, the first three gave a historical and geographical account of early Greece. Taking as his starting-point the Return of the Heracleidae, Ephorus described first of all the Dorian settlements in the Peloponnese.¹

¹ The inaccuracy of Suidas' statement that he began with the fall of Troy was observed in the previous chapter, p. 6, n. 3. Dressler's explanation that he was referring to the story of its destruction by Heracles is improbable; if only for its contradiction of Diodorus (*op. cit.* p. 9).

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

In connection with this, in spite of his disclaimer of mythology, he recorded the usual legends of Heracles, the founder of the race. He followed the customary explanation of the Dorian conquest and the dual kingship.¹ It is important to notice that his account of the Heracleidae myth was in conformity neither with the Spartan tradition nor with the biased Athenian version: the former rejected the connection between the Aigidae and Thebes, while the latter sought to establish their Athenian origin. Since he appears to have regarded Thebes as the base of their attack on the Peloponnese, we may perhaps infer that he derived his information from a Boeotian source.

In the two following books Ephorus passed in review the inhabitants of the rest of Greece, and in particular of Attica and Ionia. The lengthy quotations from Strabo, obviously to be connected with this early period, illustrate his extensive use of Ephorus, and give a good idea of the detail of the latter's narrative.² Even in their fragmentary form (and we are at liberty to assume that Strabo has copied Ephorus without amplification or even summarised him³) they include a wide range of subject; the shadowy Pelasgians, the foundation of the Olympian festival, the contemporary history of Elis, the original inhabitants of Aetolia and Acarnania: and there follows a detailed and moderately critical account of the early history of Boeotia. This section (F. 119) is especially

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 16-18 and notes.

² *F.G.H.* F. 115-127.

³ Cf. *F.G.H.* F. 149 (Strabo): τῆς δὲ πολιτείας... τὰ κυριώτατα ἐπιδραμεῖν ἀποχρόντως ἂν ἔχοι.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

important because it shows Ephorus' conception of the relation between history and geographical conditions. Thus from the observation that Boeotia has access to three seas and has a plentiful supply of good harbours, he infers its opportunities for commerce and its suitability for empire (πρὸς ἡγεμονίαν εὐφυῶς ἔχειν): blessings, however, which it never enjoyed, at least for any prolonged period, because its citizens and their leaders despised social intercourse and bethought themselves solely of military skill.¹ The influence of the sea was a point in which Ephorus was particularly interested, if we may judge from another remark of Strabo's—ἡγεμονικόν τι τὴν θάλατταν κρίνων πρὸς τὰς τοπογραφίας (F. 143), and to this extent his criticism is sound. But he has missed completely the real reason why Boeotia failed to avail itself of these advantages. The central feature of Boeotian history, which was the root cause of its inability to become a great nation or build an empire, was that the country was never unified. The dominant power was Thebes, but throughout her history she found it a constant struggle to keep the Boeotian towns together. As has been well said of Epaminondas: "He aspired to expand Boeotia into an empire; the worst of it was that no one had come before him to make it into a nation."

So much for the contents of I-III. The two following books dealt with world-geography; in the first place Europe, including Crete and the Black Sea region, and

¹ The three seaboard were: the Corinthian Gulf, for trade with the western Mediterranean, and the bays north and south of the Euripus, for trade with the Black Sea and the southern Aegean.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

then Asia and Africa.¹ In contrast to Herodotus, who combined historical facts and geographical data, Ephorus thus introduced order into his work, and effectually set the scene, as it were, for the remainder of the narrative. He followed the route which had become customary since the time of Hecataeus, working along the northern shores of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, and returning via Asia, Egypt and Africa to his starting-point, the Pillars of Hercules. In the controversy between the long-established Hecataean conception of the shape of the earth as round and surrounded by the stream of Ocean, and the Herodotean geography which rejected that conception, Ephorus took the more modern view.² For him the earth was a rectangle, bounded on the north and south by the Scythians and Aethiopians, and by Indians and Celts to east and west.

The quotations which Jacoby connects with the fourth and fifth books (F. 128-172) add on the whole but little to our knowledge of their contents. Most of them are taken from Strabo, who appears to have copied Ephorus with few alterations; we may judge from the lengthy list of places mentioned how comprehensive his work was.³ The longer passages are valuable rather as an illustration of Ephorus' methods than as a guide to his system of geography. Thus it is significant that the mention of Crete provoked a

¹ See also Appendix IV.

² Herodotus did not definitely substitute the rectangular form: he left the boundaries of northern Europe vague and gave up the idea of an all-encircling stream.

³ He touched on Spain, Italy and Sicily, Greece, Crete, the Propontis, Scythia, Asia Minor, Egypt and Africa.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

digression on a stock subject of discussion in the fourth century—the comparison of the Spartan and Cretan constitutions. Even in a geographical book Ephorus did not hesitate to insert his observations on social and educational customs.¹

The account of Greece given in I–III was continued in VI with the early history of Sparta and her relations with Argos and Arcadia. A full description of the Spartan constitution which was ascribed in its entirety to Lycurgus served as the prelude to the theme of Spartan hegemony in the Peloponnese during the eighth and seventh centuries. It should be noted that Ephorus was careful to combine the two different accounts given by Herodotus (I. 65), who recorded the separate traditions of Lycurgus' inspiration from Delphi and Crete. According to Ephorus the discovery of the laws was made in Crete, but the sanction of the oracle at Delphi was obtained before their introduction into Sparta. Apart from this the struggles between Argos and Sparta provoked a discussion of Pheidon's weights and measures; but the Messenian War which was reputed to have lasted for seventeen years was in all probability only touched on in outline; for a later book, XXII, contained a full account of it in a recapitulation of Messenia's history. In this way Ephorus filled the gap between the mythological and truly historical epochs. How much Athenian history was included in VI it is impossible to determine. Jacoby tentatively suggests that events down to the tyranny of the Pisistratids may have been given in conjunction with the main Spartan narrative. That this book covered a

¹ *V.* p. 151.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

period of two hundred years implies that it cannot have gone into great detail.¹

For the present we may omit VII and turn to the two following books which dealt with the affairs of the east, and in particular with the emergence of Persia and Cyrus' defeat of Croesus. A comparison of Diodorus' story of Eurybates' treachery (IX. 32) with fragment 58 shows that Ephorus was probably Diodorus' source. Further, the well-worn topic of the Seven Wise Men was mentioned by both historians,² apparently in connection with the celebrated interview between Solon and Croesus. It is quite likely that Ephorus digressed at this point on Solon's legislation.

For the contents of IX the fragments seem to indicate Darius' Scythian expedition, in which connection the Greek colonies of Pontus were mentioned (F. 61-62), and some account of the activities of Pisistratus in the same district. There was also the Ionian Revolt. But from this point we have little evidence of the subject-matter and still less of its arrangement until we reach the end of the Peloponnesian War.³ The Persian Wars almost certainly occurred in X. At least the battle of Marathon is undoubtedly to be included (F. 63); and the Persian invasion as a whole is such an obvious unity for separate treatment. It is unfortunate that the line of demarcation between X and XI is made more obscure by the fact that Miltiades' escapade at Paros in 489 belongs

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 177 n.

² Diod. IX. 4-14; *F.G.H.* F. 181-182.

³ Our knowledge of Ephorus for this period depends solely on Diodorus XI-XIII.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

to x, whereas its corollary, Cimon's payment of the fine imposed by the Athenians, is given in xi. Probably this passage occurred in a biographical account of Cimon's activities during the Pentecontaetia, and its chronological position would in that case be of no importance.

Moreover, with the exception of this allusion to Cimon and a reference to the Nile (apparently in a digression to be connected with the Athenian expedition in 459) not a single fragment is extant for the period 489-404. It is therefore impossible to fix limits for xi or xiii-xv. The last three must have dealt with the Peloponnesian War, but whether part of the Pentecontaetia came into xiii or not we cannot say. It is unlikely that Dressler is right when, on the analogy of Diodorus, he accepts the battles of Salamis and Plataea for the beginning of xi, and the so-called Peace of Callias in 449 for its conclusion; for there is no good reason for assuming that Ephorus would have sacrificed the unity of the Persian Wars and their suitability for separate treatment, or that he would as a partisan of Athens spoil the obvious theme of the Pentecontaetia, namely the transference of power from Sparta to Athens and the growth of the Athenian ascendancy, by dividing his narrative into two books.¹ Dressler's attempt to use such isolated incidents as the revolt of the Helots, or the Athenian defeat at Coronea, as an introduction to the Peloponnesian War, and his

¹ Dressler, *op. cit.* p. 24. Dressler would take such a sentence as ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβον τῆς ἀλλοτριότητος (after the Athenian dismissal from Ithome, Diod. xi. 64, 3) to be the beginning of a book on the Archidamian War.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

consequent allotment of these episodes to XIII has no reasonable foundation. In any case if Ephorus applied his usual rule to the Archidamian War, and accepted its logical beginning in the outbreak of the dispute between Corinth and Corcyra in 435, he would have quite enough material to fill XIII. As it happens such an arrangement suits the very probable scheme for Sicilian history in which, as will be seen, the expedition against Syracuse has been assigned to XIV.

We have now reached a point halfway through the Histories. Ephorus spent the remaining fifteen books on the short space of approximately sixty years.¹ The analysis of their contents is an easier task because more fragments have survived which afford chronological data.

The subject of XVII was very probably the anabasis of Cyrus.² Our authority for this is Diodorus' double account of the murder of Alcibiades. In the first, which is the accepted version, he states that Pharnabazus put him to death to gratify the Spartans; but immediately goes on with another story directly attributed to Ephorus which connects Alcibiades with Cyrus' plot against Artaxerxes. His murder is explained as an act performed at the instigation of Pharnabazus to prevent the king hearing of the revolt.

The two following books dealt with the Spartan

¹ I.e. including the contemporary history of Sicily and the East.

² Whether the episode of the Thirty came at the end of xv or at the beginning of this book cannot be determined. Dressler devotes xvii to the Thirty and Alcibiades' death, thereby disconnecting the latter event from the anabasis, which he places in xviii. This, of course, is contrary to Diodorus.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

campaign in Asia Minor (xviii) and the Corinthian War terminating with the King's Peace (xix). Jacoby agrees that the Peace, which marked the high-water mark of Spartan supremacy, formed the conclusion of an epoch. It is improbable, therefore, that he is right in assigning it to the beginning of xx, a book which really starts a new era—the gradual increase of the power of Thebes at the expense of Sparta. Its logical position is at the end of, and in close connection with, the Corinthian War.

The collapse of the Spartan hegemony, the Theban invasions of the Peloponnese, and Epaminondas' death at Mantinea were related in the next six books. The detail of Ephorus' narrative, who by now was certainly recording events of his own lifetime, can be conjectured from the fact that these books only covered a period of twenty-three years. Thus, including the digressions, of which we have an excellent example preserved and shortened in Diodorus xv. 66, the work was considerably more detailed than Xenophon's.¹ It is apparent that Diodorus was forced to abridge his source more and more as he progressed further into the fourth century. Thus in a single book, which cannot have been any longer than one of his authority's, he provides a short account of the whole of this period, and still has room for a few chapters on Sicily and Persia. Since, however, the amount of information on the last two topics is smaller than usual, we are led to suspect that perhaps he

¹ For the period 404-362 Ephorus took nine books, Xenophon five. The digression was on Messenian history, which was suggested to Callisthenes, Ephorus' source, by Epaminondas' resettlement of the town. *V.* pp. 132, 133.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

found the compression of his abundant material rather a difficult task.¹

For a discussion of the contents of xx-xxv Dressler offers an analysis which at first sight is competent enough. His careful subdivision of Diodorus xv combined with an examination of the fragments he had at hand led him to distribute the events of the greater part of the period 378-362 in three books of Ephorus. His reconstruction, apart from its value as an illustration of Diodorus' workmanship, is plausible and neatly executed; but his whole scheme is vitiated by Jacoby's discovery of a fragment which was not available to Dressler, and which Schwartz himself overlooked.² Müller's collection (*Frag. Hist. Graec.*) contained no reference to xxi; and this fact, combined with too facile an analysis of Diodorus xv, caused Dressler to suspect that this book of Ephorus was concerned with Persian and Egyptian history.³ Hence he assigned to it the

¹ Diodorus is of little help for elucidating the subject-matter of Ephorus, because he keeps the length of his books fairly constant without diminishing the period of years covered by each. Thus the more detail he found in his source, the more he must have abridged it. The year-content of each book is as follows: xi, 27 years; xii, 34 years; xiii, 10 years; xiv, 17 years; xv, 25 years; xvi, 24 years; xvii, 11 years. Both xiii and xiv contain much more Sicilian history than the others. It is clear that he did not shorten the periods at all until he reached Alexander.

² *F.G.H.* F. 80; cf. P.W. "Eph." col. 6, line 6.

³ Dressler (*op. cit.* pp. 23-24) divides xv into three sections, and endeavours to show that the end of each corresponded with the end of a book of Diodorus' source.

(1) Chs. 25-28; 29, 5-40; 45-50. An account of all the events which Diodorus coupled together under the heading ὁ Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος. Its conclusion was the Peace of Callias.

(2) Chs. 51-72; 75; Dressler assumes that because 76 ends with notices from the calendar-source, Diodorus came to the end of a

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

warfare between Artaxerxes and the allied forces of Evagoras and Achoris. However, thanks to Jacoby, we are able to connect **xxi** with the Athenian naval victory off Naxos in 376. We are therefore justified in believing that in any case Greek history was its main subject.

The beginning and end are difficult to determine, and especially so because no fragment has yet been discovered for **xxii**. Dressler's investigation, however, helps us to a decision. It has been seen that in his subdivision of Diodorus he supposes that the latter reached the end of a book of his authority with the Peace of Callias, and he assumes that what Diodorus calls ὁ Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος was a general name for the Spartan-Theban warfare of the years 378-371. A consideration of the contents of the surrounding books will show how admirably suitable such a period is for **xxi**.

From Jacoby's fragments the contents of **xx** and **xxiii-xxv** are established beyond doubt. Book **xx** began with an account of the extent of Sparta's power immediately after the Peace of Antalcidas: it certainly included the reduction of Mantinea (F. 79), and its *terminus ad quem*

book of his authority in 75. These events are grouped under the title ὁ τε Λακωνικὸς καὶ Βοιωτικὸς πόλεμος (76, 5).

(3) Chs. 77-89. The end of the Theban hegemony. Again a list of notices in 89 suggests the conclusion of part of Ephorus' narrative.

Dressler's attempt, although it is now known that it does not fit the requirements of the extant fragments, is interesting as an example of Diodorus' methods of using his sources. The headings under which he grouped events, if they were not his own invention, emanated from his list of dates; this is especially so in the case of (2), where we find the title coming immediately before a number of isolated notices, and after the events it describes.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

was probably the alliance of Athens and Thebes, an alliance which formed the turning-point of the Spartan supremacy. Books xxiii and xxiv included respectively the second and third Peloponnesian campaigns of Epaminondas, and xxv the destruction of Orchomenos and the events leading up to and including the battle of Mantinea.¹

It will be seen at once how well the date conjectured for the commencement of xxi, 378, fits in with the preceding book; but it is unfortunate that, while the Peace of Callias is an obviously appropriate conclusion, we are unable to give it any support because of the lack of evidence about the contents of xxii. However, that this book is not required for Sicilian history will be proved later, and it will also be shown that it is not needed to complete the tale of Persia or Egypt. For the affairs of Greece two important episodes have so far been omitted: the battle of Leuctra and Epaminondas' first Peloponnesian campaign. It is true that these events hardly cover two years, and it may be argued that even Ephorus would have found it beyond his ability to write a whole book about them. An investigation of the relevant chapters of Diodorus leads to a different conclusion.² There we find, apart from the bare narrative of the battle and the subsequent campaign, references to the portents which preceded the battle, to the activities of Jason of Pherae and his timely death, and to disorders in Argos and Arcadia. There can be little doubt that

¹ Note how carefully Ephorus seems to have separated these campaigns.

² xv. 50-63.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Ephorus included all these episodes in his history, and there is even less doubt that Diodorus was following him closely, especially in his account of Jason; for he expressly mentions Ephorus as an authority for one version of the tyrant's death.¹ Thus there was abundant material for a single book, even in the short space of two years: and more so if Ephorus digressed to record the affairs of Jason and perhaps his successor, Alexander, in loose but easy connection with the main episode of Leuctra.² In this way xxii takes its logical position in the development of the narrative.

We have got as far as xxv. Jacoby prefers to make no decision about the contents of the next book.³ The one fragment belonging to it refers to a city in Egypt which might have been mentioned in connection with the campaign of Agesilaus in that country, or in the course of a book devoted to Egyptian, and therefore presumably to Persian, affairs. Now, scattered throughout Diodorus xv and xvi are numerous references to the East; for instance, there is the revolt of Evagoras which lasted for nine years, the simultaneous secession of Egypt under Achoris, the mission of Iphicrates, and the rebellion of Evagoras II. All these incidents are mentioned by

¹ xv. 60, 5: ὡς μὲν Ἐφορος γέγραπεν.

² Diodorus' account of the fate of Helice and Buris (xv. 48-49) is given under the year 373. Quite probably Ephorus recorded it amongst the portents before Leuctra.

³ Jacoby (F. 86 n.) offers the alternatives of Greek history after Mantinea or the East. But events after Mantinea, as far as they are recorded, are confined to Thessaly and Thrace. They are insufficient by themselves to fill a book; and it was part of Ephorus' design to preserve the integrity of xxvii as an account of Philip's reign. The first alternative is, therefore, out of the question.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

Diodorus in the two books where he still has Ephorus as his authority for Greek events. But Ephorus is also regarded as the source of Diodorus' information on Persia and Egypt. Moreover, it is a safe assumption that he would have grouped the above events together, and that Diodorus distributed them chronologically and more or less accurately throughout his work. From this argument, therefore, it seems fairly reasonable to assume that in xxvi Ephorus brought the history of the East up to date, possibly to the death of Artaxerxes in 358, or perhaps even later. Diodorus' blunder in placing the Persian conquest of Egypt and the arrest of Hermeias (342) before Philip's capture of Olynthus (348) may perhaps indicate that Ephorus reached the year 342.¹

The remaining five books do not present any special difficulties. Books xxviii and xxix will be allotted to Sicily and the west: the contents of xxx, from the four fragments (F. 93-96) and from Diodorus' straightforward statement that Demophilus completed his father's work by writing a history of the Sacred War, are beyond dispute.² Book xxvii was intended to be a history of Philip.³ Doubtless the incidents in Thrace, when the Athenians sent a force to the Chersonese just before Philip's accession, were narrated in a general introduction to his reign. The book ended with the siege of Perinthus; and Jacoby has raised the only problem with regard to

¹ Diod. xvi. 52 and 53.

² See Appendix V.

³ Whether the fragments (87-88) should be dated 359 (Jacoby) or 342 (Laqueur, *Hermes*, xlvi. p. 330) makes no difference to the contents of the book.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

its contents.¹ He observes that one book, even with the omission of the Sacred War, was far too short to cover all Philip's activities if it indulged in the same amount of detail as had been expended on the rest. Besides, the siege of Perinthus is hardly a suitable topic on which to round off a world-history; a writer such as Ephorus was much more likely to choose a picturesque moment—for example the arrival of Alexander (the descendant of Heracles, Diod. xvii. 1) in Asia. Jacoby suggests, therefore, that Ephorus brought his history of Sicily up to date first, for this was considerably behind the rest of the narrative: and that he died after making a rough draft of Philip's reign. That xxvii was incomplete is perhaps supported by the fact that for the period 359–340 only an eighth of Diodorus' text is given to Philip, whereas from 340 onwards half the text is his.²

A study of Diodorus xvi shows that throughout this book he views Greek events from Philip's standpoint. Consequently there is a remarkable lack of information on Athenian political affairs, and their vital connection with the course of events is entirely missed. Thus Demosthenes is barely noticed (ch. 54), his im-

¹ Diod. xvi. 76, 5: "Εφορος... τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνθάδε κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν Περὶνθου πολιορκίαν.

² F.G.H. II c, p. 29. Cavaignac's view ("Réflexions sur Ephore", *Mélanges Glotz*, I) that Ephorus had completed xxvii which reached the beginning of the Sacred War and that he had collected materials down to Perinthus for xxx which was left in an incomplete state is discredited by Diodorus' statement that Demophilus merely completed the Histories with an account of the Sacred War (v. Appendix V). Note that Didymus who collected extracts from a number of historians on Philip's life did not quote Ephorus (Cavaignac, *op. cit.* p. 153).

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

portant rôle as an opponent of the pro-Macedonian party is forgotten, and Eubulus is not mentioned at all. Doubtless this was part of the price Ephorus had to pay for attempting to combine everything connected with Philip in one book; but at the same time it does look as though xxvii was not more than a rough sketch of the period.¹

Probably Demophilus published xxvii without revision, and completed the composition of the Histories with the thirtieth book. Laqueur has remarked that to put the Sacred War into xxvii would spoil its unity;² it was a big subject, fit for separate treatment, particularly in view of the increasing detail of contemporary history. Its reservation throws some light on the principle inherent in Ephorus' method of arrangement; but before we can sum up on that point it is necessary to consider his handling of Sicilian affairs.

II

Apart from its mention in the first of the geographical books, the history of Sicily began in vii. The one brief fragment (F. 57) offers merely a vague hint of Cretan colonisation among the Sicans. But since it will be established that in all probability xii started with the rise of the tyrants and included the Carthaginian War of 480, we may infer that Ephorus devoted some space beforehand to a description of the Greek settlements in Sicily and Magna Graecia. Actually two passages

¹ On the other hand Ephorus was not interested in political struggles. *V.* pp. 104, 129.

² *Hermes*, xlvi. p. 334.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

(F. 136, 137), which may belong to this book, speak of its early inhabitants and the Chalcidian and Dorian colonies.

The next fragment relating to events in Sicily occurred in XII, and must be dated *c.* 466. Stephanus of Byzantium alludes to Ephorus' explanation of the place-name Tyche. Apart from Stephanus, Diodorus appears to be our only authority for the mention of this place (XI. 68, 1). It was a part of the city of Syracuse lying presumably to the west of Achradina, which was occupied by the advancing democratic forces who had risen in revolt against Thrasybulus, Hiero's successor. This is the only definite information we possess. It remains to see whether we can relate this book more closely to the development of Sicilian history.

It is a commonplace that for the years 440-427 we have no knowledge of the course of events. Diodorus after mentioning the death of Ducetius in 441 (XII. 29) speaks briefly and in general terms of the increase of Syracusan power and her ambition to bring all the Sicels into subjection. The next time he has anything to say is to record the appeal of Leontini to Athens in 427 (XII. 53). However much Diodorus may have abridged his source, it is at least significant that his silence corresponds with that of other writers. This conduces to the belief that Ephorus' narrative was equally scanty.

There can be little doubt that Ephorus regarded the episode of Ducetius as one topic, and that he related it without breaking it up as Diodorus has done.¹ On the

¹ It is not, of course, assumed that Ephorus was Diodorus' source.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

assumption that he applied his κατὰ γένος principle to all parts of his work, and that he very likely regarded Leontini's appeal as closely connected with the Athenian Expedition, it is an attractive hypothesis that XII ended with Ducetius' death. The theme of this book would then be the gradual expansion of Syracuse under Gelon, Hiero and the democracy, leading up in its dramatic value to the conflict between the full-grown Syracusan power and the Athenian Empire, which came in a later volume. At the same time it must be admitted that such a reconstruction cannot go beyond the region of possibility.

For the Athenian Expedition no fragments are extant, but it has been accepted that the substance of Diodorus' account came from Ephorus.¹ Its position as the link between the Archidamian and Deceleian Wars and our belief that XIII-XV were devoted to the whole of the Peloponnesian War suggest that Ephorus recorded it in XIV. Dressler takes the same view (*op. cit.* p. 19).

Fragment 68, which is assigned to XVI, is the next with definite information on Sicilian affairs. Here is a reference to Entella, a town whose inhabitants were Campanians and allies of the Carthaginians. To what particular incident was Ephorus alluding? The answer to this question will depend on a consideration of the various occasions on which the town is mentioned.

It first came into prominence in 403: nothing is recorded of its earlier history beyond the fact that its original inhabitants were traditionally known as Ely-

¹ See Appendix I and Holzapfel, *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*, ch. III.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

mians. In 405 Dionysius I had become στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ at Syracuse, and had concluded a peace with Carthage. Two years later, faced with a revolt of the citizens, he saved himself by getting the assistance of some Campanian mercenaries who had been in the service of the enemy, and after securing his position afresh, he despatched them to the Sican town Entella; there, after ruthless treatment of the inhabitants, they formed the first Italian settlement in Sicily.¹

The Campanians, however, finding themselves within the Carthaginian sphere of influence forsook their loyalty to Syracuse; and after Dionysius had broken the treaty by the capture of Leontini, he invested Entella as one of the bases of Carthaginian power (398).²

A later reference seems to be out of the question, for Entella is not heard of again until the third war with Carthage (368), whereas Ephorus' continuation of the Sicilian narrative in xxviii mentioned events which occurred at least as early as 385-383. It is therefore possible to assign approximate dates to xvi. Apart from Diocles' code and the banishment of Hermocrates, we know nothing of Sicily until 409.³ Then a fresh outbreak of the long-standing dispute between Acragas and Selinus led to the former's appeal to Carthage. At that point an entirely new chapter of Sicilian history began of which the central figure was Dionysius I. Ephorus

¹ Cf. Diod. xiv. 9.

² Cf. Diod. xiv. 48, 5.

³ The loss of the Syracusan squadron at Cyzicus may have resulted in a short digression on its political results at home. Hermocrates' banishment and the code would in that case have occurred in xv in connection with events in Greece.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

probably took the same point of view, and accepted that year as the beginning of a new era. But conjecture alone can suggest the date of its ending. Dionysius' reign seems to divide into two well-defined parts, and the point of division is the year 392, which witnessed the end of his first struggle with Carthage. In the peace terms his authority over the Sicels was at last recognised; and this was the basis on which he built his empire. The examination of xxviii, the next book on Sicilian affairs, will demonstrate how probable this ending is.

It is difficult to co-ordinate the fragments of xxviii into a coherent whole, because their dates vary considerably and seem in one case to overlap the previous book. Amongst others there is an undoubted allusion to the colony at Pharos which was planted by the Parians in 385 at Dionysius' instigation and under the auspices of Syracuse; and there is the further reference to the city of Herbita, which, as will be seen from the note below, may be dated *c.* 403 or 396.¹ Unfortunately each of these years conflicts with the date suggested for the conclusion of xvi. At the same time its connection with a later event which subsequent historians have forgotten or neglected is unlikely.

The difficulty is solved by a recollection of the probable

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 89 and 91. The two dates are obtained as follows:

(1) Dionysius, disregarding Carthage's stipulation that the Sicels should remain free, attacked Herbita (*c.* 403) and secured the expulsion of its tyrant Archonides.

(2) About 395 he made a treaty with Herbita; we possess no details, but Bury has aptly suggested that the unusual title Ἀρχὼν τῆς Σικελίας which he appears to have had some years later was conferred on him at this time to emphasise his relation to the Sicels (*C.A.H.* vi. p. 118).

subject-matter of xxviii. It has already been observed that the year 392 marked a turning-point in Dionysius' reign. In xvi he had consolidated his position in Sicily; in xxviii he extended his influence over southern Italy and the coasts of the Adriatic. The reference to Herbita is justified in the light of a digression either on the extent of his power, or if Bury's theory is accepted, in a description of his titles to authority. The latter appears to be the more likely connection. The rest of the book was occupied with his second and third wars against Carthage, and ended with his death in 367.

The last book of the Histories which was written by Ephorus was devoted to a continuation of Sicilian affairs. Presumably it included the reign of Dionysius II, a supposition which is supported by a reference by Stephanus of Byzantium to Istros, one of his colonies in Iapygia (c. 358).¹ Doubtless xxix was also intended to record the exploits of Timoleon; for it certainly reached the point at which he sailed from Corinth in 344. Ephorus seems to have given details of the suppression of his brother's attempted tyranny (F. 221)—an account which would naturally fit into a chapter explaining the reason why he was chosen for the deliverance of Syracuse. But beyond this we cannot go, interesting as it would be to know whether Ephorus left this book also in an un-

¹ Dressler (*op. cit.* pp. 16-17) rejects the book-number given by Stephanus and claims xxix for events in Greece. He also regards the numbers of F. 89-91 as spurious and assigns the second part of the reign of Dionysius I and the whole of his successor's to xxii (for which no fragments are extant). His scheme for Sicily is thus different from that outlined above. Since he advances no reason for his rejection beyond the desire to allot xxii to Sicily, it is considered unnecessary to go into his account at length.

THE CONTENTS OF THE HISTORIES

finished condition, and whether it was written before or after XXVII.

It remains in a final paragraph to discuss the principle on which he arranged his universal history. We have already defined it as an account of the world as a Greek of the fourth century knew it;¹ that is, the history of Greece was the main subject, and the sequence of events was only occasionally interrupted in order to bring a rather disconnected part of the narrative up to date. The plan was such that each book was a whole in itself, although it was related more or less chronologically with its neighbours.² Thus there was a tendency for the different parts of the narrative to overlap, as in the biographical digression on Cimon or the omission of the Sacred War from the record of Philip's reign. Nevertheless the criticism that Ephorus' system implied the total abolition of an annalistic framework is unjustified, except perhaps in the earliest books, where a reckoning by generations was coupled with the parallel exposition of the history of the various states. The later books, especially those dealing, for instance, with Epaminondas' campaigns, had some respect for chronological sequence. These books also illustrate Ephorus' method of subdividing a long and detailed period such as that between

¹ Thus non-Greek peoples came in only in so far as they were connected with Greek history: Bury, *Ancient Greek Historians*, p. 163; v. also *F.G.H.* II c, p. 25, line 25.

² Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 4: "Jedes Buch... sollte eine gewisse Einheit bilden." The fragments of Ephorus in Oxy. Pap. 1610 which seem to fall into three groups, Themistocles' exile, Cimon's operations against the Persians and Persian affairs, suggest that up to book XI at least Ephorus dealt with the subdivisions of each book in a similar way.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Leuctra and Mantinea; for the four consecutive books can each be regarded as a separate unity.

Thus although the foregoing investigation rests largely on a basis of probability, the reconstruction it affords seems trustworthy, and clearly indicates Ephorus' arrangement on a subject-system. Some of its importance will be seen in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

AN assessment of Ephorus' merit as an historian depends upon the consideration of three groups of evidence. There are the actual fragments of his work embodied in quotations made by later writers; secondly, he is the accepted source of at least five books of Diodorus (xi-xv); and thirdly there is the Oxyrhynchus papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908. The authorship of this gave rise to minute and prolonged controversy; and the fact that it is still in dispute makes its discussion imperative, as it might revolutionise the theories commonly held since the early part of the last century, not only on Ephorus' ability, but also on his methods and the length of his narrative. The connection between him and P (as the editors called the unknown author of the papyrus) is established through Diodorus. Although the majority of the facts seem to be against their identification, Dr Walker, covering in greater detail the ground previously explored by Judeich, has made out a strong case for Ephorus in his lectures published in 1913.¹ Since then no work has appeared in England which has thoroughly investigated the question again. Unfortunately the verdict for or against him rests on evidence which is cumulative in effect, but seems at first to make a decisive answer difficult. The protagonists in

¹ *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia.*

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

what has now become a classic contest are the editors of the papyrus, whose decision in favour of Theopompus was more vigorously supported by Meyer,¹ and later critics, such as Judeich,² whose main arguments are reviewed and expanded by Dr Walker. More recently Jacoby has developed an entirely new aspect of the problem by putting forward and defending the claims of Daimachos, a Boeotian historian of the fourth century. The purpose, however, of the present inquiry is not so much an attempt to reopen the question in order to maintain the correctness of any of these opposing views, but from the knowledge gained by an examination of Ephorus' case to define clearly his relationship to the author of the papyrus. Some light must thereby be thrown on his talents as an historian.

The reader of the *Hellenica* cannot fail to be impressed by its wealth of detail (it covers barely a year and a half in some nine hundred lengthy lines), its apparently strict chronological arrangement in summers and winters (col. III. 9: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦδε τοῦ θέρους... ἔτος ὄγδοον ἐνείσπτηκει), and its competent criticism and analysis of motives. For example, the account of the formation of the anti-Spartan league in 396 (col. II) refutes the view that Persian gold was the sole cause of the outbreak of war against Sparta, and touches on the more likely reason, namely the long-standing irritation felt by the Argives and Boeotians because Sparta fostered internal discord in their states. This is certainly a more penetrating and reasonable hypothesis: the bribes of Timo-

¹ *Theopomps Hellenika*, 1909.

² *Rhein. Mus.* 1911, p. 94 sq.

crates were of secondary importance. Again, we may note the careful description of the party feeling at Thebes which led up to the Corinthian War (col. XII. 31 sq.), and the correct analysis of Ismenias' aims in seeking an alliance with Athens.

The date of its composition can only be fixed within the broadest limits. The section dealing with the Boeotian constitution implies that it was written after that constitution had been changed at the Peace of Antalcidas. The phrases εἶχεν δὲ τὰ πράγματα τότε οὕτως (XI. 38) and τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔθνος ὅλον οὕτως ἐπολιτεύετο (XII. 29) plainly referred to a state of affairs which no longer obtained. On the other hand there is the suggestion that the Persian Empire was still standing in the use of the present tense to describe the financial lapses of the Great King,¹ and in discussing the border dispute between Phocis and Locris the writer gives no hint that he knew of the destruction of the Phocians in the Sacred War. P must therefore have been written after 387, probably before 346, and certainly not later than 331, when Alexander destroyed the empire.²

¹ V. XVI. 2: ἐμισθοδοτοῦντο ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν κακῶς... ὁ ποιεῖν ἔθος ἐστὶν αἰεὶ τοῖς πολεμοῦσιν ὑπὲρ βασιλείας. Cf. XIX. 5: εἰσι γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Μυσῶν αὐτόνομοι βασιλείας.

² Both Judeich (*op. cit.* p. 97) and Jacoby (*F.G.H.* II c, p. 6, line 32) incline to the belief that it was written before the end of the Sacred War. Meyer also agrees with this view (*op. cit.* p. 89). It is worth noting that Ephorus wrote book IV after 356 (v. p. 12); the events given by P occurred in book XVIII, which, if Ephorus is the author of P, must have been written about the same time. This is unlikely. Judeich (pp. 102 and 119 nb. 1) admits that Ephorus may have lived to see Alexander in Persia without realising that almost certainly this rules out the identification with P on the ground of the present tenses.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

The scope of the work is also difficult to determine. It may have been intended to be a continuation of Thucydides, whose last book was concerned with the period November 413–September 411, and terminated soon after the beginning of the Deceleian War. In col. II of the papyrus we have a recital of Timolaus' exploits in that war at Amphipolis and elsewhere, accompanied by the remark: ὥσπερ εἰρηκὰ πού καὶ πρότερον (II, 27). This is sufficient indication that the historian had himself related these incidents. In the other direction, however, we have no evidence at all. The suggestion of Grenfell and Hunt (p. 122) that so well informed an author cannot have written more than two generations later than the events he records is of little value. The history may have reached a point about thirty years later than 395, but its elaborate scale seems to preclude that possibility. It is quite probable that it ended with the battle of Cnidos in 394. Lastly, among other characteristics of P should be noted his tendency to digressions, his pro-Spartan sympathies (although Conon is considered of more importance than Agesilaus), and his colourless style combining the usual fourth-century avoidance of hiatus with frequent repetition of the same word.

The strongest link in the chain of evidence which leads to the identification of P with Ephorus is the close similarity between him and Diodorus, a similarity often in the facts recorded, sometimes in the actual words, on which no one has laid more stress than Dr Walker. A detailed account of these passages is given in Appendix VI.¹

¹ This appendix also gives lists of passages in which Diodorus has a shorter version, or has omitted much that is found in P.

THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

The following points emerge from an examination of them. Firstly, there are a number of verbal resemblances. This is the most potent weapon in the armoury of the champions of Ephorus, and Dr Walker has taken full advantage of it in his lectures. Its value, however, must be heavily discounted when we find a difference in the order of events, or an unexpected and important omission by Diodorus, who was presumably following his authority very closely. Secondly, Diodorus has abridged P's version to an alarming extent. He has gone so far as to misrepresent the actual facts. Thus he implies that Sparta was the aggressor in 395, whereas P goes into great detail to prove the opposite. Agesilaus, again, is hurried to Greece to play his part in the Corinthian War without any reference to his interrupted campaign in Asia Minor. Thirdly, Diodorus is very confused in his chronology. If he had read P carefully, he could hardly have failed to distinguish the correct sequence of events at Rhodes. The strong case founded on the appearance of similar words is undermined by the discovery of serious discrepancies.¹ We are not justified, therefore, in asserting definitely that Ephorus was the author of the papyrus. It is much more likely that Ephorus' work was the medium between Diodorus and P: that he arranged, and, as will be seen, enlarged P's narrative to make it fit into his own world-history; and in so doing he perhaps omitted important details. Diodorus wrote with a copy of Ephorus in front of him, and in shortening his account deviated still further from P. This will

¹ Contrast the much closer agreement of Diodorus with Oxy. Pap. 1610.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

account for the peculiarities of Diodorus' arrangement, and makes the verbal similarities between him and P not impossible; from what is known of Ephorus and Diodorus there is little reason to assume that either of them was above copying or even copying out the unvarnished tale of his predecessor. Further, the position of an intermediary who used P some time after publication suits the approximate dates assigned to him and Ephorus; and the assumption that the author of the *Hellenica* was writing contemporary history favours the acceptance of this hypothesis. Hence the argument for identification which is based on the fact that both failed to narrate the Sacred War is superficial in the extreme. Jacoby also admits the cogency of this opinion: "In any case we must recognise in him (P) the source to which Ephorus owed his wide knowledge of the older Boeotian history. . . the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* was the chief source of Ephorus for the period after Thucydides."¹

The author of the papyrus was either unusually successful in collecting information about the topography of Asia Minor, or he had himself first-hand knowledge of it. His details of the campaigns and marches of Agesilaus are extensive and accurate; some of his facts are in none of the other extant sources for the period. For example, col. vi. 30 describes the advance of Agesilaus to the upper Meander in the late summer of 395: Diodorus omits this entirely, and so does Xenophon.² It is a commonplace, on which perhaps too much em-

¹ *F.G.H.* II c, p. 4, lines 1-7, and notes to Ephorus, F. 71-78: "Vorlage für diese Zeit vor allem die *Hellenika* von Oxyrhynchos."

² Diod. xiv. 80, 5; Xen. *Hell.* III. 4, 25.

phasis has been laid, that Ephorus was well acquainted with the districts of Asia Minor. His enthusiasm for his birthplace Cyme was a doubtful virtue, as far as accuracy was concerned; but the fact that he was one of the principal sources of Strabo bears witness to his reputation in antiquity;¹ and modern criticism of Strabo confirms the correct position of his place-names. The advocates of Ephorus' claims to the authorship of P have made the most of this rather inconclusive point; but if the probable length of a book of Ephorus can be shown to be incompatible with that of the papyrus, it carries but feeble conviction. Moreover, if the supposition that P and Ephorus are one be granted, the responsibility of Diodorus for his mistakes is considerably increased.

A parallel argument has been advanced in the comparison of Ephorus and P with regard to digressions. According to Polybius the former must have been almost as famous for them as Herodotus. We should expect to find some trace of this in the papyrus. The most important passage in this respect is the one dealing with the Boeotian constitution. Grenfell and Hunt (p. 121) regard this as a serious interruption in the course of the narrative. After some thirty-six lines devoted to a description of the Boulae we return to the factions at Thebes: we are then unexpectedly told how the small Boeotian towns became rich at Athens' expense in the Decelean War: then suddenly the stage is set again for the political intrigues of Ismenias, who determined to profit by the dispute between Phocis and Locris. Apart

¹ Strabo quotes him by name more often than any of our other authorities.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

from its great historical value (Meyer calls it "das Glanzstück des ganzen Fragments"),¹ the only justification for its insertion could be to show how extensive the influence of the anti-Spartan party was amongst the members of the federal council. It is indeed a useful supplement to Thucydides' information on the government of Boeotia; but it is of no practical importance for a discussion of the causes of the Corinthian War. Is it not more likely that Ephorus omitted the above passage from his universal history because of lack of space and its apparent irrelevance than that Diodorus neglected it altogether after he had discovered it in his source? For on another occasion, in book XI (79 sq.), of which the derivation from Ephorus is beyond dispute, he does not fail to devote four or five chapters to the reorganisation of the Boeotian League and the battle of Tanagra, events which occupy only a few lines in Thucydides. A somewhat similar chapter in Strabo (4, 16), which is directly inspired by Ephorus, contrasts the Spartan and Cretan constitutions. Admittedly Strabo is merely giving a summary (τὸ κυριώτατον ἐπιδραμεῖν). The subject was a commonplace of the rhetorical schools and it is not unexpected in a pupil of Isocrates.² In fact the opening sentences have the flavour of a political treatise of the Isocratean type. It is noteworthy, however, that while Ephorus records social and educational customs in an uncritical and discursive manner, the Hellenica's account of the or-

¹ *V. op. cit.* p. 92 sq.

² Schwartz (P.W. "Eph." col. 13, line 48): "stammt aus der Tagesliteratur, die...das Problem der besten Verfassung diskutierte".

THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

ganisation of Boeotia is concise and clear. It makes its points briefly, if not easily. It is hardly credible that the same authority was responsible for both.

Arguments from style, especially in the case of such fragmentary material on both sides, bear little weight. In so far as we can draw any conclusions they are against the identification. The writer of the papyrus was careless in his choice of vocabulary, and did not scruple to repeat the same word frequently. The most obvious instance of this is the word *στράτευμα*; it occurs eleven times in sixty lines: *βαδίζω* is used on ten occasions, often close together: and other favourite words are *ἀνίστημι* and *παροξύνω*. Add to this the close repetition of whole phrases,¹ and we may sum up our author's style as dull and, except for the description of the mutiny of Conon's troops, monotonous. Ephorus' style will be discussed elsewhere; he does repeat the same words, but those he uses most often are not found anywhere in P. Also, while P has sometimes sacrificed order to avoid hiatus, there is no trace at all of a feeling for structure or effect. The few fragments of Ephorus from which any deductions can be drawn suggest a periodic arrangement, which sounds like a brittle imitation of Isocrates.² He is unlike the author of the Hellenica in the use of rare words, his fondness for speeches and sententious remarks. Further, Ephorus was certainly not impartial, but revelled in an opportunity to criticise or appraise the character of a

¹ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ταῖς προσηρημέναις occurs twice in col. II, and κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστη twice in col. XII. It is doubtful, too, whether any difference of meaning was intended in συνακολουθεῖν and ἐπακολουθεῖν (col. VI).

² V. pp. 149, 150.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

prominent man.¹ He clumsily twisted the web of history to the greater glory of Athens. With one doubtful exception (col. x), we have nothing of this in P: Judeich points out his cold impartiality² and commends him for refraining from praising Agesilaus (col. xviii. 30). Above all, if we may, on the strength of tradition, grant Ephorus the least rhetorical brilliance, the papyrus affords no instances of it.

A critical estimate of the view-points of the two historians leaves small doubt of their different capacities, or of the superiority of P. Ephorus was interested in personalities, P records historical data. Ephorus turned the pageant of history into an excuse for moralising, which was more entertaining, but less scientific. P's attempts at discovering right motives and selecting appropriate causes show his capability. We have seen how he explains the origin of the Corinthian War, and rejects Xenophon's superficial interpretation. With this may well be compared the quotation from Ephorus (Diod. xii. 39 sq.) on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Accepting Jacoby's reconstruction, which involves the omission of the Alcibiades story on the ground that Diodorus was using another source, we are left, never-

¹ E.g. Themistocles, Pausanias; cf. the preface to Diod. xrv.

² *Op. cit.* p. 99 ("nüchterne Objektivität"). Cf. Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 7, line 9 sq. But P is displeased with the Athenian democrats (ii. 10-14): Ephorus is pro-Athenian (v. ch. vi). P tends to favour Sparta: Ephorus was no lover of Sparta. Ephorus' knowledge of Theban affairs which Busolt claims to have found is easily understood if he acted as an intermediary between P and Diodorus, especially if P had "a very detailed local source" (Meyer, *op. cit.* p. 90) for his Boeotian history. This is one of the chief points made by Jacoby in his argument for Daimachus.

theless, with a bald statement, not even an explanation, of the Megarian decree, and Pericles' irrational use of it to thrust the credulous Athenians into war for personal reasons.¹

An objection, to which too little regard has been paid hitherto, is to be found in a comparison of the historical methods of Ephorus and P. The latter is remarkable for his precise chronology: if he is not quite as accurate as Thucydides, he is infinitely better than Xenophon. The narrative is dated probably by years and certainly on the Thucydidean principle of summers and winters (col. III. 10). The mention of events in the Decelean War which Thucydides was unable to reach leads to the assumption that P is possibly a continuation of his work. Besides, if we accept, in agreement with Grenfell and Hunt's careful argument (p. 207 sq.), the view that the *θέρος* in line 9 refers to the summer of 396, then the *ἔτος ὀγδοόν* of the next line must coincide with the archonship of Eucleides (403-2). The restoration of the Athenian democracy after the fall of the Thirty was an eminently reasonable place to choose as the starting-point of a new epoch. There is no hint in the papyrus that the author dealt with Sicilian affairs: Dionysius' expansion of the Syracusan power over the Sicels and his first war with Carthage had no repercussions in Greece; and P is only concerned with the activities of the three most important towns, Athens, Sparta and Thebes, the groupings of the smaller cities round them through self-interest and intrigue, and their relationship to Persia. It seems, therefore, true to say that the author

¹ *V.* Chapter VII.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

was writing under the influence of Thucydides to show how the protagonists of the Peloponnesian War worked out their destinies.

Ephorus, on the contrary, was writing a universal history arranged by subjects. It has been shown elsewhere how this principle is inherent in Diodorus' narrative, which represents an attempt to combine a consecutive chronology with a subject-system. The compromise was a failure, for it led to frequent inaccuracies in dating; but in that failure we have conclusive evidence that Ephorus did write as tradition maintains. Hence Judeich's¹ denial that there can be any precise knowledge of his arrangement is ridiculous; it detracts from, rather than adds to, the worth of his argument. Dr Walker in his earlier defence of Cratippus admits the divergence of Ephorus and P on this point (*Klio*, 1908, p. 356); he supports this by the statement that if the former wrote a universal history he could never have devoted three-quarters of a book to the events of eighteen months. Five years later, however, as Ephorus' advocate, Dr Walker has reversed his position, and suggests that one of his books might extend to rather more than four thousand lines. His argument for the identity of Ephorus with P, which depends on the proof that their books were of equal length, is not altogether satisfactory.² A comparison of the appropriate parts of Diodorus with the fragments of Ephorus shows that book xvii (Eph.) included certainly the death of Alcibiades, and probably the Expedition of Cyrus; xviii began with Thibron's campaign in Asia Minor, related his supersession by

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 110.

² *Op. cit.* p. 39 sq.

THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

Dercyllidas, and finished with the recall of Agesilaus to conduct the Spartan offensive in the Corinthian War.¹ This book, therefore, included the events given by P. The identification rests on the possibility of their equal length.

This question turns, first, on the hazardous calculation of the number of lines in a book of Ephorus, and secondly, on a reconstruction of the complete book of P. Dr Walker's assessment on the analogy of Theopompus and Polybius of an average of 4500 lines for a book of Ephorus is perhaps secure; but we cannot prove that book XVIII in particular conformed to this total. If we may argue from a rough calculation of the number of lines in the complete books of Diodorus based on the Teubner text, it is evident that these ranged from 2300 to 4000 lines. Hence Cavaignac's arguments break down completely in which he tries to prove by an examination of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri 842 and 1610 that Diodorus' narrative for the fifth century represents only half of what Ephorus originally wrote, and but one-tenth for the fourth; for he bases all his calculations on the undemonstrable assumption that Ephorus' and Diodorus' books were of the same length.²

Secondly, it is not possible to assess the length of the complete book of P with sufficient accuracy; for while there are some 900 lines for the period of a year and a half, we do not know where the book began or ended. P's work is, however, on a much less elaborate scale than that of Theopompus, who boasted that the twelve

¹ V. Appendix III.

² "Réflexions sur Ephore", *Mélanges Glotz*, I. p. 148 sq.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

volumes of his *Hellenica* ran to 150,000 lines.¹ These books, a continuation of Thucydides, covered the years 411-394. The longest lines in any extant papyri contain between forty and fifty letters, the shortest, fifteen (cf. Grenfell and Hunt, XIII, p. 292). On the assumption that Theopompus was boasting of his output and had therefore selected the shortest ones he had written (which were a third the length of P's), we may calculate a minimum of 50,000 lines for the twelve books, or something more than 4000 for each which covered little more than a year. Further, P was in all probability shorter than Ephorus; for if Theopompus required 4000 lines for one year, surely Ephorus must be granted the same amount at least for a period of four. Ephorus thus seems to have enlarged P's account.² At the same time this does not imply that he had as great an abundance of accurate detail as P, for the difference between them was just the difference between a concise and a diffuse narrative.³ Once again, therefore, the evidence points towards Ephorus as an intermediary between P and Diodorus.

There remain to be considered the narratives of writers other than Diodorus which show some resemblance to P, and the remarkable disagreement between the latter and Xenophon's *Hellenica*. Let us take these points in turn. Grenfell and Hunt notice a certain similarity between the papyrus and Polyænus. In a long article entitled "Über die Quellen...der Strategemensammlung Polyäns", Melber has proved with abundant detail his dependence

¹ V. *F.G.H.* II b; Theop. F. 25.

² Jacoby recognises this (*F.G.H.* II c, p. 30, line 34 sq.).

³ Cf. *F.G.H.* T. 25: πολλήν μὲν ἱστορίαν παραδίδωσι.

on Ephorus.¹ He had direct access to the Histories and did not obtain his information at second-hand; for, while he writes in accordance with Ephorus' tradition, he often adds to Diodorus. For example, his account of the murder of Tissaphernes is fuller, but the substance of both passages is the same.² This too is one of the cases in which Polyaeus appears to agree with P (col. VII. 4 sq.), although the latter was probably much longer. A more important instance occurs in col. I. All our authorities, except Polyaeus, connect Timocrates' mission with Tithraustes, presumably after he had superseded Tissaphernes. However, since Tithraustes could not have reached Sardis before the summer of 395, the Persian envoy must have arrived in Greece after the commencement of the Corinthian War. But obviously he arrived before.³ Actually, in spite of the forces arrayed on the other side, Xenophon, Plutarch, Pausanias, P's agreement with Polyaeus in attributing the despatch of the gold to Pharnabazus entitles both of them to more respect, and in particular Polyaeus' source, whoever it may have been.

Two other writers are somewhat similarly associated with P, Justin and Pausanias. Each was indebted to Ephorus. Of Pausanias little need be said. The support which he seems to afford P and Diodorus on several minor points is insignificant (cf. Grenfell and Hunt, p. 214, n. 13). Grenfell and Hunt notice two occasions on which Justin was apparently inspired by P. He is, for instance, our only authority for the mutiny of Conon's

¹ *Jahrb. f. Philologie*, Suppl. Bd. XIV.

² Poly. VII. 16.

³ Cf. Grote, IX. p. 110 with C.A.H. VI. p. 45.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

troops.¹ Volquardsen has deduced from a comparison of parallel passages of Justin and Diodorus that, where both differ from Herodotus (as in the description of the battle of Thermopylae), their accounts spring from the same source. It follows that the source was Ephorus. When, therefore we discover that P and Justin alone mention the mutiny, the probability is that it was also recorded by Ephorus. There can be no doubt of the connection between him and the papyrus.

As for Xenophon, the fact that he frequently offers a different account from P is a matter of great interest.² In the past his work has been recognised to be the most important authority for the first half of the fourth century. Grote showed a marked preference for him: if Diodorus could not be brought into line, he was discredited. The discrepancies between Xenophon and other historians were reconciled generally in favour of the former. However, with the publication of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* criticism of Diodorus entered on a new phase, and with it our estimate of Ephorus' abilities; for whether we admit the identity of P with him or not, it cannot be denied that all three historians used the same body of facts. Diodorus discovered an historical tradition which was quite independent of Xenophon; and although we may not be disposed to alter our verdict on his abilities, preferring to condemn him for his uncritical treatment of his material, someone in that line of tradition is worthy of praise for his habit of accurate

¹ Notes to col. xvi. 2 and 29.

² V. Appendix VII. Busolt (*Hermes*, XLIII. p. 255 sq.) has a full discussion of this point, and leaves no doubt of the independence of the two historians.

statement and discerning analysis. An investigation of P and Xenophon emphasises the correctness of this view. P contains entirely new information; he is always far more detailed; his additional facts appear to be accurate, and on more than one occasion he corrects Xenophon's account, sometimes to the advantage of Diodorus. There is no trace of the anti-Theban bias usually attributed to Xenophon; and by holding the scales impartially between Agesilaus and Conon, he illustrates the transient value of the Spartan king's Asiatic campaigns in contrast with the slow but successful steps by which Conon renewed the power of Athens.

Summing up, it is evident that Diodorus, Justin, Polyaeus and Pausanias followed the tradition established by P. Amongst their authorities were the histories of Ephorus. Are we then justified in accepting him as the author of the papyrus? In the preceding discussion the various aspects under which this question has been argued have been passed in review. Their effect is cumulative and beyond dispute. Taken by themselves, some of the arguments are not conclusive; together, they present an imposing front. More decisive, too, than the others, is one which has often been forgotten or brushed aside. Just before the publication of the papyrus, Blass observed that Ephorus' claim to have written a universal history arranged by subjects definitely precluded his authorship of a work which exhibits a combination of accurate chronology with abundant detail.¹ The difficulties which

¹ Cf. the arrangement of Oxy. Pap. 1610 with P. But it must be admitted that Ephorus probably paid more regard to a consecutive chronological system in the later books.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Diodorus encountered in fitting his narrative into an annalistic framework have been pointed out. He could not have blundered so much if a copy of P had been in his hands. The final conclusion, therefore, is that whatever name may be assigned to P, he cannot be identified with Ephorus.

What was the relationship between them? Two choices are open to us: either Diodorus had both authorities in front of him at the same time, or he used Ephorus alone, whose history of this period was an enlarged, but less accurate version of P. There can be no definite solution; but the balance of probability is in favour of the latter alternative. Holzapfel has shown that Diodorus' description of the Peloponnesian War agrees in the main with 'Thucydides':¹ where it deviates, it does so to misrepresent the truth for the glorification of Athens. If in this part of his history Diodorus had worked from two sources, the smallest particle of honesty would have compelled him to acknowledge the superiority of Thucydides, and accept his account to the exclusion of Ephorus. This he did not do: as a consequence his work is tainted with the inheritance of Ephorus' Athenian partiality. Hence there is no reason to assume that after neglecting a valuable authority for a difficult period of Greek history, Diodorus was suddenly converted to the necessity of checking his information by reference to P. Had he done so, the discrepancies would be unaccountable. Moreover, it is in any case improbable that he would have troubled to consult two works, the second of which was largely a duplicate of the first. Jacoby's question

¹ *V.* p. 98.

whether Diodorus used an epitome of Ephorus, while it makes the explanation of the verbal similarities between him and P harder, raises no difficulties and does not invalidate the above argument.¹

On the other hand, it is by no means unlikely that Ephorus made a direct use of P, writing, as he did, comparatively soon afterwards.² He deserves some commendation for the choice of such an authority. After allowing for all his characteristic faults, it must be admitted that he drew his information from a reputable writer, who has won more credit from modern criticism than his better preserved and more famous contemporary. Schwartz's scathing references to Ephorus' mistakes must be softened in the light of this knowledge; for his information is not altogether valueless. Unconsciously, perhaps, he has bequeathed some accurate details to posterity.

¹ *F.G.H.* Eph. F. 191 n. But the close similarity of Oxy. Pap. 1610 with the relevant passages of Diodorus makes the use of an epitome unlikely.

² It should be noted that more recently Laqueur inclines to this view (*P.W.* "Theop." col. 2193 sq.). But this new defence of Theopompus as the author of the papyrus does not meet all the objections (*Grenfell and Hunt*, v. p. 131 sq.); and the identification is especially difficult if Ephorus wrote more copiously than P.

CHAPTER IV

THE PREFACES

THE preface was a distinctive feature of Ephorus' work which had not been employed as a recognised form of composition by any previous historian; he was the first, in fact, to regard it as a necessary adjunct of historical writing. The origin, however, did not lie with him, but with the usages of rhetoric as developed in the pamphlets and speeches of the orators;¹ nor was he the only historian of the fourth century to adapt it to his own purposes. Theopompus, perhaps also under the influence of Isocrates, is coupled with him by Photius (F. 7) for the close similarity of thought and style which marked their *πρὸς μὶα*; and Dionysius rebukes him in company with Anaximenes for considering the preface an opportunity for praising himself and attacking other writers.² Moreover, Polybius was aware of its extensive use (XI. 1); for, looking back on the works of his predecessors, he could criticise it as a common literary device which, for reasons which will be discussed later, he suddenly decided to abandon in the early stages of his history. We need, therefore, have little hesitation in agreeing with Laqueur's generalisation that such introductory chapters were specially characteristic of Hel-

¹ Cf. the opening passage of Isocrates' *Evag.* I-II, and for the recognised use of prefaces, *Paneg.* 13.

² *V. F.G.H.* II b, p. 115, F. 24.

THE PREFACES

lenistic historiography. It remains to see if we can discover anything of their application and treatment in Ephorus.

Laqueur's article, which is the *locus classicus* for the origin of Diodorus' prefaces, can be said to have proved its case for their derivation from Ephorus;¹ but his implied theory that each of them corresponds with a separate preface of the latter's cannot be maintained: first, because Diodorus' rapid narrative presents his authority only in a very abridged form—as, for example, in xv, which includes the contents of no less than six books of Ephorus; secondly, because in one instance at least he must have combined two or more προοίμια. Thus in the introduction to xii, after remarking on the changes and chances of this mortal life, he proceeds to a discussion of the prosperity which Greece, and the Athenians in particular, enjoyed during the Pentecontaetia; but in a list of the famous men of that age are found Plato, Aristotle and Isocrates. Similarly, in the preface to xiv Diodorus illustrates his moral by the examples of the Thirty Tyrants at Athens and the tyranny of Dionysius. It is obvious, that either we must admit a complete lack of connection between Ephorus' prefaces and the contents of the ensuing book, or else Diodorus has conflated several passages from his source; for it is quite certain that no single book of Ephorus contained an account of the Thirty in conjunction with the history of Sicily. The belief that the fault must be attributed to Diodorus finds confirmation in the προοίμιον to xx. Ephorus was no longer behind him; but the

¹ *Hermes*, XLVI. p. 161 sq.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

argument that elaborate speeches are unsuitable in a history (προσθήκην ἐποιήσαντο τὴν ὅλην ἱστορίαν τῆς δημογορίας) savours of Ephorus' distinction between history and rhetoric (v. F. 111); and in any case it is surprising that Diodorus, who had contented himself with a brief recapitulation instead of a preface in the four preceding books, should suddenly and not altogether successfully resume his customary method. The lack of προοίμια in XVI-XIX was not due to a decision, as in Polybius' case, to avoid spending time on rather irrelevant material, but to the failure of his inspiration on reaching the end of his source.¹

On the assumption, therefore, that Ephorus' thoughts are reflected in Diodorus' prefaces, it is necessary to examine their contents. It will be seen that their range of subject is unusually small, and that all can be reduced in their simplest terms to an explanation of the scheme and purpose of his work. The longest and most appropriate example occurs in I. 1-5: there he upholds the value of universal history, which finds its pragmatic sanction in the benefits it confers on the common life of mankind, and the importance of a didactic treatment based on the (Isocratean) categories of ψόγος and ἔπαινος. In other places he maintains the advantages of a κατὰ γένος arrangement (v. 1), or criticises Ephorus' omission of the mythological epoch (iv. 1). Such remarks

¹ V. Laqueur, *Hermes*, XLVI. pp. 204-206. He sums up: "gering war die Selbständigkeit Diodors in XVII-XIX, und doch wurde ihm selbst diese geringe Arbeit zu viel". Diod. I. 42, II, III conform to the recapitulation-type, XI conforms to neither. Laqueur, after a detailed study of the codex, suggests that the προοίμιον has been lost (p. 166).

THE PREFACES

are interspersed with moralising platitudes, as, for example, on the unaccountable mixture of good and evil which falls to man's lot, and Fortune's peripeteia in the unexpected results of the Persian invasion; or again, there is the truism based on the story of the Thirty, that people in responsible positions should take greater precautions to avoid misdeeds, because it is impossible for their actions to remain unnoticed. Equally important, too, is the conception of a theme underlying a series of events. It is a well-known fact that Ephorus ascribed the beginning of the Spartan hegemony to the benefits conferred by Lycurgus' constitution; and it is significant that Diodorus, in his preface to the disasters of Leuctra and Mantinea—which, incidentally, cannot have been drawn from one book of Ephorus—considered this a fitting opportunity for censure: for Sparta, by her harsh behaviour, had sacrificed a supremacy which had lasted for five centuries.¹ Further, the chief interest in the Pentecontaetia is the increase in Athens' power and the corresponding growth of Spartan jealousy.

The resemblance between Diodorus' observations and some of Ephorus' leading ideas is well illustrated by a consideration of the six fragments assigned by Jacoby to the *προόμια*. These Laqueur did not investigate, but they give valuable support to his theory. Of these three at least can be connected with the preface to the whole of his work (F. 8, 9, 109), of which the two latter were probably closely related; for they deal with the very subject which Diodorus has criticised, the neglect of

¹ Note Diodorus' ingenuous remark: *τούτοις ἀρκούντως ἐπιτετιμηκότες* . . . , XV. 1, 6.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

pre-Dorian history. Thus the statement that accounts of the remote past which pretend to any degree of accuracy are naturally suspect certainly occurred in an explanation of the choice of the Return of the Heracleidae as a starting-point; and in a similar connection was the assertion of Ephorus' belief that the Greeks were not as old as the barbarians. The first fragment—that music was invented only for deception—merely indicates one of the faults to which the *προοίμια* were especially liable, namely the tendency to side-track the writer into irrelevant issues. There is, in addition, another fragment which Jacoby suspects of being connected with the general introduction to the *Histories*: Ephorus claimed that personal investigation and practical experience were the first qualifications in an historian (F. 110).¹ This is quoted from Polybius, who did not miss the opportunity for an attack on his capability in the sphere of military affairs. Lastly, there is a reference to the distinction between history and epideictic literature, which, if we may judge from its context in Polybius, sprang perhaps from a defence of the historian's craft, which maintained that it was quite as difficult as the rhetorician's (F. 111).

Hence, according to the evidence of Diodorus and the fragments, the prefaces were largely concerned with the personal comments of the author on his methods and aims as an historian; but it is hard to believe that the same subjects recurred in each of Ephorus' twenty-nine books. At the same time from our knowledge of Ephorus it is not likely that Diodorus' remark—*προοίμιον ἐκάστη*

¹ One is reminded of Thuc. 1. 22, 2: οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἤξιωσα γράφειν. . . ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν.

THE PREFACES

προθείς—is untrue. A way out of the difficulty is suggested by a criticism of the latter's in XIII. 1. He omitted the προοίμιον to this book, and excused the omission on the ground that, although the preface affords a pleasant resting-place to the reader, it is unsuitable in the course of a lengthy history: accordingly he will pass it over (τὸν πολὺν λόγον τῶν προοιμίων παραπέμψαντας). It is only logical to assume that Diodorus has abandoned its use altogether; but this he does not do. We have the examples of XIV and XV to prove that this was only a temporary omission. To explain this inconsistency Laqueur has proposed that Ephorus had grown weary of preface-writing and was excusing himself for neglecting to prefix one to the corresponding book (XIV).¹ But against this it may be said that it contradicts Diodorus' statement given above: that Ephorus' book (XIV) only corresponds to the first thirty-three chapters of Diodorus (XIII), and that the latter could easily have selected a προοίμιον from elsewhere for insertion at this point. Besides, the passage reads too much like Diodorus' own criticism to admit of Laqueur's interpretation. It is more reasonable, therefore, to take his words at their face value and to assume that, in his efforts to abridge an abundant source, he discovered an instance in which the preface was so remotely connected with the ensuing narrative that its inclusion, apart from its pleasant literary value, was of no importance. Moreover, it is known that Polybius gave up the practice in his eleventh book: "The reader", he says, "too often neglects the preface because of its lack of connection with the rest of

¹ *V.* also p. 79.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

the book, whereas a résumé of past events is bound to be useful διὰ τὸ συμπεπλέχθαι τῇ πραγματείᾳ."

On the testimony of Diodorus and Polybius, while we cannot enlarge our knowledge of what Ephorus wrote, we may discern at least one of the defects of his system: the προοίμιον, much as it served for the expression of brilliant personal comments (ἐπιμετροῦντες λόγοι, T. 23), had the weakness of irrelevance, a weakness which probably increased in proportion to its stylistic elaboration. The natural beginning of a speech or essay was not in the best interests of historical composition;¹ but it was yet another example of the literary trend which had overtaken history. The development of the preface on these new lines was due to the pupils of Isocrates, and Ephorus in particular used it as a stalking-horse for the exposition of his own views, aims, and rhetorical skill. He is thus once again the link between Isocrates and Diodorus. Unfortunately, its use was its own corruption. In the hands of all but the best its literary value was negligible; in the hands of the worst it thinly disguised the author's historical incompetence.

¹ Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* III. 14: τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιόν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ λόγου, ὅπερ ἐν αὐλήσει προσαύλιον.

CHAPTER V

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES

THE question to what extent the works of Ephorus bear traces of Isocrates' influence is not one which admits of an easy answer; for although an historian who had been a student in the Isocratean school would be expected to betray some indication of his training, some similarity of ideas or literary style, the search for them in the abridged version of a third-hand authority does not appear likely to be productive of much success. Of the extant fragments only two might possibly show some connection with Isocrates either in thought or language.¹ In spite, however, of this paucity of information, the orthodox approach to the problem through the pages of Diodorus does disclose remarkable traces of similarity.

Isocrates' political principles, the subjects of his greatest speeches, were the most likely part of his teaching to reappear in later works. Unfortunately, the inheritance of his ideas was not necessarily, or even probably, confined exclusively to the circle of his pupils; it is impossible to tell, for instance, how far the central theme of the *Panegyricus* had become the common property of thinking men at least a decade before Ephorus began to write his history; for the greater literary output of the fourth century secured a faster transmission of ideas.

¹ F. 116 and 149; the first eight lines of the latter have an Isocratean flavour.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

We must exercise caution, therefore, in attributing to his influence passages from Diodorus in the belief that Ephorus acted as an intermediary; although the remoteness of Diodorus from him both in time and thought, and the certainty that Ephorus was almost his sole authority until the accession of Alexander, makes it improbable that the similarity he occasionally shows should have been derived from any other source.

How close Diodorus and Isocrates really are is well illustrated by Volquardsen, who begins his search for Diodorus' authority with a comparison of certain passages with Isocrates.¹ He observes how inevitable it was that Ephorus and Theopompus should make use of the sentiments expressed in the *Panegyricus* and elsewhere, which were concerned with subjects they had to discuss in the course of their own histories. Apart from the identity of thought, the first two pairs of passages show a remarkable degree of verbal resemblance. More important still is the third quotation. It is surprising enough that both Diodorus and Isocrates declare that Dionysius of Syracuse and Artaxerxes gave their moral support to the Spartans *c.* 380 to uphold their hegemony; but it is even more surprising to find that Ephorus took the same point of view, and that these three writers are our only authorities for the understanding. There can be little doubt that its transmission to Diodorus was due to Ephorus, or that Isocrates invented it to discredit the Spartans and arouse resentment against the barbarians.²

¹ *Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor*, pp. 49-51. The passages are quoted in Appendix VIII.

² The *Panath.* shows how unfair Isocrates could be to Sparta.

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES

In close connection with this is the favourite Isocratean concept of a panhellenic movement against Persia. Kaerst, in attempting to trace the propagation of Isocrates' ideas by writers who came under the influence of his political pamphlets, cites Ephorus' assertion of a coalition between Persia and Carthage in 480: further, he suggests that its origin was probably a statement of Isocrates advocating war against the former country.¹ The belief in this concerted attack on the Greek world appears not only in a fragment of Ephorus, but in Diodorus as well.² Hence, although no direct evidence is available from Isocrates himself, the idea was probably his, and, if so, we have another instance of his influence on Ephorus and Diodorus.

Moreover, Kaerst's theory receives valuable support in his discovery of a mistake in Diodorus, xi. 55. The Spartans, after claiming that Themistocles had conspired with Pausanias, demanded that he should be tried before the common council of the Greeks, which was accustomed to sit at Sparta at that time.³ However, such an assembly did not exist: Diodorus was confusing the Peloponnesian League with a fiction born of the panhellenic conceptions of the fourth century, which was derived ultimately from Isocrates.

If we turn to consider Ephorus' Histories in relation

¹ Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, i. p. 149^{sq.}

² F.G.H. F. 186 and Diod. xi. 1.

³ The words are ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Momigliano (*Filippo il Macedone*, p. 194) sees the influence of Isocrates' panhellenism in Diod. xi. 3 τὸ κοινὸν συνέδριον, τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας; xi. 29 εἶπεν τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐλευθέρια κοινῇ; and in the exaggerated bravery of the Athenian troops against the Persians in Egypt (xi. 77).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

to Isocrates, it would seem that he was perhaps indebted to his master for his conception of the scope and purpose of his work. A universal history, devoting the larger part of its space to the issues of the Greek-speaking world, was bound to emphasise the concept of the unity of that world in its opposition to the barbarian;¹ and the strange belief in the alliance of east and west against the Greeks tended to stress the importance of their collaboration. Secondly, just as Isocrates intended his political training to be of practical value, and achieved the high colours of his written speeches by a sweeping and not impartial system of condemnation and praise,² so Ephorus exemplified the didactic nature of his work by the same means, entirely unconscious of the fact that such an artificial technique was the handmaid of art, but not the servant of historical accuracy. Not realising the proper use of an accepted literary device he abused its application, with the result that the legitimate weapon in the hands of the pamphleteer became a dangerous toy in those of the historian.³

One further point which seems to unite both writers

¹ But, beyond the statement that the Greek states "willingly" submitted to Philip, Diodorus (Ephorus) expresses no satisfaction that Isocrates' cherished leader had come.

² *Panath. passim*; esp. 53-58, which chapters Laqueur (*Hermes*, XLVI. p. 345) believes to be the source, through Ephorus, of Diodorus' preface on the downfall of Sparta (xv. 1). In the *Evagoras* (5) Isocrates expresses his didactic purpose: ἐχρῆν... ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς ἀνδρᾶς ἀγαθοὺς γεγενημένους ἵνα... οἱ τε νεώτεροι φιλοτιμοτέρως διέκριντο πρὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν. Cf. *Nicocles*, 7.

³ It is in this sense that we must understand Volquardsen's remark (*op. cit.* p. 49): "grade von Isokrates wurde ja durch seine Schüler Ephorus und Theopomp die Geschichte zur Dienerin der Rhetorik gemacht".

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES

is their sympathy for Athens, and their desire to secure her glory even with the sacrifice of truth. The next chapter will show the lengths to which Ephorus dared to go; and it is sufficient for our present purpose merely to note the appearance in the *Histories* of what must have been a prominent feature of the Isocratean school. Laqueur explains in this way Diodorus' embarrassment in the preface to XIII; and although we have rejected his suggestion that Ephorus' partiality for Athens prevented him from seizing the obvious opportunity for censuring her,¹ it is remarkable that, with the exception of the Spartans who fell at Thermopylae, in no instance is praise given to any of their famous men: instead, there is the lengthy condemnation of Pausanias (xi. 46), who is made to play the part of a foil to Aristides, and the brief and almost grudging mention of the death of Agesilaus (xv. 93). Isocrates' admiration for Athens' past was tempered only as he became convinced that the possession of a navy and an overseas empire was detrimental to her best interests; and in the *Peace* he effectively illustrates this by reference to the Sicilian Expedition: it is, perhaps, significant that a comparison of this passage (86) with Diodorus (xiii, 21, 3) proves the close similarity of their views.²

Let us now examine the *Histories* as an example of Isocrates' style. Here we are on much more difficult ground in attempting to draw a distinction between what was Isocrates' own contribution to literary form and the

¹ *Hermes*, XLVI. p. 203.

² On the other hand note the strange divergence of Isocrates' opinion of Pericles. Was this due to Ephorus' uncritical use of a bad source? *V.* p. 110.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

general practice and content of fourth-century rhetoric. The stock discussion of the best polity, which always involved a comparison of the Spartan and Cretan constitutions, the correct formulae for the orthodox description of battles, and the knowledge of famous systems of legislation, may not truthfully be ascribed solely to the Isocratean school; it cannot be said, therefore, with certainty that their occurrence in Ephorus was owing to his studies at Athens.¹ Moreover, Schwartz, the bitter opponent of any tangible relationship between him and Isocrates, admits the identity of style which characterises their writings, although he implies that this is the only sense in which any connection can be found between them. On the other hand, Kalischek's more recent book has entirely dispossessed Schwartz's view, although he admits that the argument from style alone is not convincing owing to the fragmentary nature of the evidence.² The only fragment which has any relevance for our investigation is a direct quotation from one of Ephorus' prefaces by the lexicographer Harpocration: it is a reasonably good imitation of the periodic construction favoured by Isocrates, but we are not justified in drawing any further deductions from it.³

Although his task of abridging an almost equally

¹ Thus Jacoby doubts the accuracy of Niese's claim that the *Areop.* 39 sq. inspired Ephorus' remark (F. 139) that a large number of laws does not imply a well-governed state. See *Hermes*, XLIV. p. 176.

² Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." cols. 8-9. The best part of Kalischek's argument is on Isocrates' and Ephorus' pragmatic view of history (pp. 8-12).

³ V. p. 151, note 1. Note that Dionysius (T. 24) couples Isocrates and Ephorus together as examples of τὴν γλαφυράν σύνθεσιν.

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES

uninspiring authority may, perhaps, win our indulgence, nothing could be more uninspiring than Diodorus' prose. Its flat repetition of phrases and the unbalanced structure of its sentences prove that, however important the author considered a world-history to be, he was not interested at all in the manner of its presentation; for only on the rarest occasions does he seem to have appreciated the value of literary form. These occasions are the prefaces, the panegyrics, and the speeches, in particular those concerned with the fate of the Athenian prisoners at Syracuse. Here the reader will observe Diodorus' efforts to enliven his narrative by the use of a more carefully constructed sentence. The speeches, too, have a flavour of rhetoric about them, thin and artificial as it appears; and the sentiments expressed are such as are not found elsewhere in his work. Such changes must spring from Ephorus, and perhaps reflect the style which he had learnt from Isocrates.¹

An attempt must now be made to sum up the extent of Isocrates' influence. We are at once confronted with the conclusions reached by modern critics, men certainly well qualified to judge in accordance with the literature which was at their disposal at the time when they reached their decisions. The most critical, and the most destructive one, is Schwartz's. It was made at a time when the cold and impartial estimate of facts, which was the hall-mark of the good historian, was beginning to per-

¹ For the speeches at Syracuse see Diod. XIII. 20-27, esp. 25, 2. Other speeches in Diodorus, e.g. XIII. 52, 2; XIII. 102, 2 are too short to be of value for this discussion. Holzapfel (*Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*, iv) attributes the Syracusan speeches to Ephorus.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

meate the arena of literary criticism: Schwartz's article is an outstanding example of the rigid rejection of everything which cannot be proved by overwhelming evidence to be true. In regard to the problem with which we are now dealing, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that his examination of the probable relationship between Ephorus, Diodorus and Isocrates was conducted without the least sympathy for the traditional account. He does not seem to have given enough weight to the striking resemblances between Diodorus and Isocrates; and to allow merely the influence on Ephorus of fourth-century rhetoric in general is a result which is at once inconclusive and dissatisfying.

At the other end of the scale we have Laqueur's well-known dictum that a book of Ephorus is an excerpt from Isocrates fully elaborated with historical and rhetorical details.¹ In some ways, no worse condemnation of an historian could have been invented, and Ephorus would have been the first to deny that he gave equal importance to rhetoric and history. Jacoby's careful suggestion, which takes a middle course between these two extremes, bears witness to Laqueur's exaggeration. "Ephorus", he says, "was too much interested in the arrangement and purpose of his work to make rhetoric his chief concern."²

Thus from our review of the evidence it would seem that Ephorus was certainly under the influence of the Isocratean school both in thought and style, and that his

¹ *Hermes*, XLVI. p. 345: "Ein ephorisches Buch ist ein ins Detail ausgearbeiteter historisch-epideiktischer Exkurs des Isocrates"; also in the same volume, p. 204, where he speaks of the "complete dependence" of Ephorus on Isocrates.

² *V. F.G.H.* II c, p. 23, line 4 sq.

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES

writings give expression to both these factors of his training. Evidence from style is admittedly always dangerous, and not least in the present argument where its basis is so fragmentary. There is, however, no good reason to reject the close parallelism of thought and, on occasions, the extraordinary cases of verbal resemblance. We cannot, therefore, agree with Jacoby that Ephorus cannot be assigned definitely to a particular school of philosophy, or with Schwartz, that his ideas spring solely from the main currents of fourth-century thought. If he was the pupil of Isocrates, as all the evidence of classical writers seems to show, he had every reason to introduce Isocrates' political wisdom into the relevant parts of his history; and that he did so, bears out the long-established tradition. It remains to be seen how well he fulfilled his rôle as an historian.

CHAPTER VI

BIAS IN EPHORUS

IN spite of Bury's dictum that freedom from bias is not possible amongst historians, the measure of their freedom from it is still the standard by which their critics assess their capacity; for it is evident that at all epochs in the world's history the impartial accumulation of facts is the greatest service that can be rendered to later generations. Of all historians, ancient or modern, probably not one would admit that this had not been his aim; and yet it is the irony of his profession that, consciously or unconsciously, the subtle influence of his particular political or religious aspirations pervades his work. The ancient writers, with the possible exception of Thucydides, who nearly succeeded in maintaining his avowed intention of bequeathing a true record to posterity, were especially liable to this fault: and if Thucydides was the first he was also the last scientific historian for a considerable time to come.

The second half of the fifth century witnessed the growth of a principle more destructive than anything else of Greek political ideals. The exaggerated idea of freedom both individual and corporate, which was carried to its logical conclusion in almost every department of Greek life, led inevitably to the theory that the cleverest speaker secured the most votes; in other words, politics was equated with oratory. From this the transition to dema-

gogy was easy. Ability to speak was the first requisite of political success, and teachers were not lacking to supply the demand. In the first two decades of the fourth century schools of oratory sprang up; the most famous was that started by Isocrates in 392. It was here under the high-sounding title of φιλοσοφία—the sublime art of statesmanship—that the subtler arts of effective speaking and writing were taught to all who cared to pay the fees. From this school an ever-increasing number of students went back to their homes with varying hopes of success; carrying perhaps, as Ephorus is said to have done, the advice of their master on the suitable use of their instruction. Thus literature became permeated with the glitter of rhetoric; for incapable speakers might still become competent historians.

Partiality is a bad enough fault in an historian, but under the influence of rhetoric it is still more harmful; for it enables him to deepen the colours of his contrasts, to grant unmerited heroism to his heroes and to deprive his enemies of their just deserts. The weakness of these two defects is not lessened by a pragmatic view of history, especially when the holder of it believes in his ability to provide moral edification. It then becomes his duty to administer justice to his characters by a system of praise and blame, a system which, as we have already seen, was a favourite literary device amongst the pamphleteers and politicians of the fourth century. Ephorus was the first to apply it seriously to the writing of an orthodox history; and it was the chief cause of the failure of his good intentions. He travelled, and was judged a competent critic; but his anxiety to keep the mote from his reader's

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

eye prevented him from discovering the beam in his own.

When we come to consider the bias which coloured Ephorus' view of history, the first, but not the most important, defect is his pride in his native town. There is the celebrated statement of Strabo that, whenever he had nothing to record about Cyme, he remarked that "at the same time the people of Cyme were at peace": if this was true, it is fortunate that Diodorus did not preserve it; but whether true or not, it indicates that Ephorus did not intend his birthplace to be forgotten in the history of the world. The extent, moreover, to which he allowed this local patriotism to pervert the truth may easily be seen from the many other instances which Diodorus does record. For example, it was a Cymeian, Tyrrastiades by name, who informed Leonidas at Thermopylae that he was surrounded: previously, it was at Cyme that the Persian fleet had mustered in the spring of 480, and it was there that they wintered after the disaster at Salamis. In 408 Alcibiades' expedition against Ephesus failed signally, and Diodorus goes on to record that, after making false accusations against Cyme, he attacked it: he was repulsed, but returned with a larger force and ravaged its territory. The Cymeans took their complaint to Athens; by a happy coincidence other charges of disloyalty were being brought against him, and he fled into exile. The story has been given in full, because it illustrates how Ephorus went out of his way to mention Cyme without, in this instance, the slightest provocation. The silence of the other records is sufficient proof of its fictitious character.

Again, part of the Spartan fleet, after its defeat at the battle of Arginusae, fled to Cyme. The fact is insignificant if it did not disagree with Xenophon; but in the next chapter Ephorus, not content with the honour of such a visit, records that the whole coastline about his city was strewn with the débris of the wrecked ships. Later, in 396, Agesilaus made it his headquarters for ravaging the Persian provinces; a fact which cannot be reconciled at all with Xenophon's account. Lastly, Diodorus devotes a whole chapter of his work to the details of a totally insignificant struggle between Cyme and its neighbour Clazomenae over the disputed possession of a tiny hamlet situated between the two towns.¹

We may neglect the fact that Diodorus' abridgment of the Histories has probably omitted many other references which justified Strabo's remark; for the instances quoted above are sufficient for an estimation of the importance of Ephorus' defect. It is not that these few brief statements of isolated facts in Cyme's history are likely to give a different view of the course of events during the fourth and fifth centuries: it does not ultimately matter whether the Spartan wreckage was found on the shore or not. The point of importance is that such interference with the truth in matters of small moment promises the possibility of falsification in more serious cases. The

¹ The passages referred to in order are Diod. xi. 8; xi. 2; xi. 27; xiii. 73; xiii. 99, cf. Xen. *Hell.* i. 6, 33; xiii. 100; xiv. 79, cf. Xen. *Hell.* iii. 4, 11-15; xv. 18. For further passages v. Diod. xiii. 97; xiv. 35; xv. 2. V. also Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* ii. p. 106, n. 4, and p. 217, n. 2. Volquardsen, *Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor*, pp. 59-62. Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 7, line 30 sq.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

writer of a universal history, who has more need than the annalist of a short and isolated period to preserve a sense of proportion, thus betrays a false perspective. As Schwartz has said, to permit the assumption that Cyme's complaint was the prime cause of Alcibiades' banishment, or that the petty squabble (*Katzbalgerei*) with Clazomenae was of equal importance with the history of Leuctra and Mantinea, argues a sad want of intellectual honesty. Ephorus' claims of Cymeian origin for Homer and Hesiod have already been noticed, and were perhaps pardonable in the days of genealogies; but it will be seen shortly that his failing was not confined to such minor issues.

The arguments of the preceding section have shown Ephorus' dependence on Isocrates and have explained the transference to him of conceptions peculiar to the Isocratean school, and in particular its characteristic sympathy for Athens. The purpose of the present inquiry is to show how and when this sympathy appeared in Ephorus' narrative, and to assess the effect it had on his accuracy as an historian. The books of Diodorus which afford evidence on these points are XI–XIII, which cover the years 480–404. In the later part of this period Diodorus' narrative presents many interesting contrasts with that of Thucydides, always to the advantage of the latter. In fact, our knowledge of Thucydides' reliability gives us a useful standard for our verdict on Ephorus. It will become evident that Ephorus was strongly biased in favour of Athens and against Sparta: that this led him to minimise Athenian defeats and losses, and to exaggerate those of her enemies: and that his

choice and criticism of sources were not altogether satisfactory.

Let us first examine Diodorus' account of the Persian Wars and the Pentecontaetia. It was an undisputed fact that Athens' prestige and her position for the greater part of the fifth century were due to her unexpected success in the struggle against Xerxes. Accordingly we should expect Ephorus' sympathies to manifest themselves at this stage. This they do, but it is rather in the general colouring of the narrative that we detect his hostility to Sparta. Several points, however, do stand out. In the discussion whether to resist the Persians at Salamis or to retire behind the Isthmus barrier, stress is laid on the selfishness of the Spartans who were thinking only of their own safety—a remark which is surely unjustified by their behaviour at Thermopylae: when the prize of valour is awarded after Salamis, mention (rather prematurely) is made of the Spartan suspicions of Athens—a theme which recurs frequently in Diodorus: and at the battle of Plataea a stubborn fight between the Thebans and the Athenians is recorded, in which the former were defeated, although they fought brilliantly.¹

The period between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars is most prolific in examples of Ephorus' faults; for on no less than three occasions he was able to indulge in his "moralising platitudes" on the virtues and vices of the great. The first is a typical contrast between Pausanias and Aristeides, of course to the benefit of the latter, which

¹ V. Diod. xi. 15: τῆς ἰδίας μόνον ἀσφαλείας φροντίζοντες; xi. 27: προορώμενοι τὸ μέλλον (is this vaticinium ex eventu?); ἐφίλοτιμοῦντο ταπεινοῦν τὸ φρόνημα; xi. 32: καρτερᾶς μάχης... λαμπρῶς ἀγωνισαμένων.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

is well summed up in the two parallel sentences at the end: Pausanias' treachery deprived his country of her leadership on the sea, while Aristides' virtue placed an unexpected power in the hands of Athens. Secondly, at the close of the long episode of Themistocles' activities comes his encomium, also to the detriment of Sparta; and thirdly, there is the extravagant praise heaped on Myronides' victory at Oenophyta. He is compared with the heroes of old, Miltiades and Themistocles, and the battle with those of Marathon and Plataea: actually, however, this one was even more glorious, and the Athenians deserved special praise, because then they were fighting with mere barbarians, but now with Greeks—Boeotians.¹ The Athenians certainly get their due share of renown.

When we turn to the events of these years, we find still more instances of Ephorus' sympathies. The vigorous Spartan attempts to stop the Athenian wall-building, and their ungenerous attack on Themistocles are strongly emphasised: in fact, the whole story of his dealings with them appears to have been framed to their discredit.² There is no doubt that the anti-Athenian party at Sparta was active during this time; but there is also no doubt about Ephorus' exaggeration when he asserts (ch. 50) that the Spartans were thinking in 475 of fighting Athens for leadership on the sea; in any case they had no navy with which to dispute the ἡγεμονία θαλάττης at this time. If Ephorus' statement were true, its repetition

¹ V. Diod. xi. 46-47, 58-59, 82.

² V. xi. 55 sq. and Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 14, line 25, who remarks on the "antispontanischen Erfindungen" of this section.

after Cimon's dismissal from Ithome is unnecessary.¹ Moreover, his treatment of Cimon suggests that he was under the influence of democratic ideas at Athens. His source of information about the latter's career was extremely meagre, and he does not give a fair estimate of the part he played in the development of the Delian confederacy. His ostracism is not mentioned and his death, in spite of a biased account of his last campaign, is very briefly recorded without the familiar encomium. The only honour he gets is to be cited in the company of Miltiades and Themistocles in the chapter on Myronides' exploits quoted above. The discussion of Ephorus' sources will prove that he relied only too frequently on accounts written from the patriotic Athenian standpoint: a plausible explanation of his brevity on Cimon would be the use of an *Atthis*, written in the special interest of Athens and perhaps from a democratic point of view.² To such an authority might also be due the recurring phrase of Diodorus concerning Athens—πολλήν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάβανε (xi. 62).³

Diodorus' account of the Egyptian expedition presents a surprising contrast with Thucydides. Agreement is preserved up to the point when Megabyzus diverted the water flowing round the island Prosopitis. Thucydides

¹ Diod. xi. 64, 3: ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξέλαβον τῆς ἀλλοτριότητος, ὅστερον δὲ αἱ πόλεις διηνέχθησαν, καὶ μεγάλους ἐπανελόμενοι πολέμους ἐπλησαν πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα μεγάλων ἄτυχημάτων. Is it possible that Ephorus knew of the story, attributed to the Thasian Stesimbrotus, that the Spartans promised to invade Attica if Thasos revolted?

² V. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* iii. 1, 24. The narrative of the Pentecontaetia was in all probability "neben Thukydides aus einer *Atthis geschöpft*".

³ Repeated in xii. 1 of Greece, with special reference to Athens.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

dryly and briefly observes that the Persian general then crossed and captured it: the cause of the Greeks, who had been carrying on the war in Egypt for six years, was brought to naught, and only few of the many who had gone thither escaped to Cyrene: the majority perished. He proceeds a few lines later to tell how the greater part of a flotilla of Athenian and allied ships, which had been sent to help the expedition and knew nothing of its disaster, was lost in a sudden attack off the Mendesian promontory. On the other hand Diodorus, whose account runs through four chapters, might almost be describing an entirely different expedition. When the Persians diverted the stream, the cowardly Egyptians immediately made a truce, and left their Athenian allies in the lurch. These burnt their ships, and "excelling the courage of those who died at Thermopylae" prepared to fight to the last. The Persian general, seeing that their unbounded courage (ὑπερβολὴν τῆς εὐτολμίας) would involve the loss of many myriads of his troops, made a truce. The Athenians departed safely to Cyrene. Ephorus, in his enthusiasm for Athens, has forgotten to mention the naval disaster: it is not difficult to decide that he neglected Thucydides' account.¹

The period 459-447 is equally interesting and important, and, as the time of the unsuccessful attempt of Athens to create a land-empire, should tempt Ephorus to indulge in what would appear to be his usual disregard of unpleasant facts. A summary of the relevant points in Thucydides for the first two years is as follows. The Corinthians, who had fallen out with Athens over her

¹ Cf. Diod. XII. 71, 74-75, 77, with Thuc. I. 104, 109-110.

alliance with Megara, fought two naval battles with the Athenians: they were successful in the first at Halieis, and lost the second at Cecryphaleia. Meanwhile the Athenians were engaged in warfare with Aegina, and the Corinthians seized the opportunity to invade the Megarid. Myronides was despatched from Athens with "the oldest and the youngest", and both sides set up trophies after an indecisive battle. The next event of importance was the battle of Tanagra, which, according to Thucydides' short notice, the Spartans won. Sixty-one days later, however, the Boeotians were defeated heavily at Oenophyta.

Diodorus' account is worthy of notice because it diverges considerably in detail, and definitely on the side of Athens. Warfare broke out, for no ostensible reason, between Corinth and Athens. The battles of Halieis and Cecryphaleia were fought, both of which ended in the defeat of the Peloponnesian troops. In contrast to Thucydides' impersonal account, it should be noticed that on the first occasion "not a few" of the enemy were killed, while for the engagement at Cecryphaleia they had collected a "considerable force". After this the Athenians were successful in Aegina, and the Corinthians advanced into the Megarid, apparently because the people of Megara had just made an alliance with Athens. Myronides won a hard-fought battle and slew many of the enemy. Diodorus then comes to the battle of Tanagra, the result of which was indecisive: at Oenophyta, however, Myronides enjoyed a brilliant victory over a numerous foe (πολλοπλασίους), in spite of the fact that part of his army did not arrive in time. This was the

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

victory which inspired Ephorus to write a panegyric on its hero, and to claim the approbation of posterity as the first historian to give a full description of it. His sympathies are clearly visible in every statement: he transforms defeats into indecisive results, and battles of doubtful issue into victories: and if he has no further news about a victory, he mentions the large numbers of the enemy. Incidentally his post-dating of the Megarian alliance reduces the opening of hostilities to an absurdity by removing the cause of Corinth's complaint; and either he or Diodorus is responsible for the duplicated notice of the battle of Oenophyta.¹

The rest of the period we set out to study is uneventful until we reach Cimon's expedition to Cyprus. The investigation of the appropriate chapters of Diodorus is useful because of the light it throws, not only on Ephorus' inaccuracy, but also on what appears to be the harmful influence of the Isocratean school. From Thucydides' terse narrative we learn that Cimon led a force of two hundred ships, of which sixty were detached to go to Egypt, to blockade Cition: he died, however, in the course of the blockade, which was thereupon raised; and a fleet under an unknown commander won a sea- and

¹ Thuc. i. 105-110; Diod. xi. 78-83. The doubled account occurs in chs. 81-83. No name is given (81) for the site of Myronides' victory: 82 is given up to the eulogy, with the exception of five lines, which imply that the battle was definitely finished and that the Athenians were ravaging Boeotia. Then (83) the Boeotians appear on the scene and are defeated at Oenophyta. There is little doubt that one and the same battle is being described: perhaps Diodorus got entangled in the encomium. Cf. XIII. 34 and 36, where he gives two similar accounts of the Athenian naval disaster at Oropus.

land-battle at Salamis. The Egyptian detachment then returned, and the combined fleets sailed back to Athens.

Diodorus has a very different story to tell. Cimon sailed to Cyprus with the same number of ships and captured Cition and Marion after a siege. Of the two Persian generals, one, Artabazus, was in Cyprus with the fleet, the other, Megabyzus, was in command of the army in Cilicia. Cimon defeated the fleet, pursued the remnant to Phoenicia, and continued his long journey to Cilicia, where he routed Megabyzus' troops. Anaxicrates, the second Athenian general, was slain. Thus ended the events of the first year of the war.

In the second year Cimon vigorously attacked Salamis, the Persian arsenal in Cyprus, with the result that Artaxerxes asked for peace. Callias, who led the deputation, returned with the peace that bore his name. After giving a full report of its conditions, Diodorus rounds off the episode with a brief notice of Cimon's death.¹

In the first year of the war Diodorus' account is substantially the same as Thucydides'. There is the expected deviation about the capture of Cition, and the not unexpected doubling of the Eurymedon story (*v.* Diod. XI. 61-62), which separates the sea- and land-battles, if not by several hours, at least by a few hundred miles. It is tempting, also, to suggest that not Anaxicrates, but Cimon, died; and that the former is Thucydides' unknown general. So far, if we discount the pro-Athenian tendencies of Diodorus' source, the

¹ Thuc. I. 112; Diod. XII. 3-4.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

framework of the story is a rough approximation to that of Thucydides.¹

It is the following chapter which has been the cause of much difficulty and controversy. Thucydides himself knew nothing of a peace with Persia as the sequel of Cimon's expedition, which ended, as far as he was concerned, with the successful homecoming of the fleet. Two facts have led modern critics to believe that the treaty, at least in the precise form recorded by Diodorus, was a forgery of the fourth century: firstly, the earliest evidence in Greek literature of its existence occurs in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*: secondly, the conditions which Cimon was fortunate enough to impose on the Great King would clearly not have been, and, in fact, were not observed by Artaxerxes. The reason for the appearance of the peace in the pages of Diodorus is not hard to discover, when we recall Isocrates' partiality for Athens and his influence on Ephorus. It was an invention which originated, not perhaps in the Isocratean school, but in the general prejudice against Sparta which was current during the first twenty years of the fourth century, and which reached its climax at the time of the Peace of Antalcidas. The suspicion of its forgery is increased by the significant discovery that both Ephorus and Isocrates used it as propaganda for the high principles of Athens in contrast with those of Sparta, who surrendered the Ionian Greeks into the hands of Persia. It is not disputed

¹ It is interesting to note that Aristodemus, a late fourth-century historian, who combined Thucydides with a pro-Athenian (Ephorus?) source, gives yet another version which appears to be a mixture of the two. *V. F.G.H.* II 2, Aristodemus, F. 13.

that Athens may have entered into an informal undertaking on the lines of recognised spheres of influence in the Aegean; but the perversion of such an agreement into the form of a definite treaty merely for the sake of propaganda is a reproach to Isocrates, and a lasting stigma on Ephorus' historical ability; for, apart from the obvious disregard of the truth, it involves doubling the length of the campaign, and inventing an extra battle as an explanation of its occurrence.¹

Diodorus' narrative from this point until the outbreak of the quarrel between Corinth and Corcyra has little bearing on the present discussion. He passes quickly over the indisputable Athenian defeat at Coronea, touches on the revolt and reduction of Euboea, and omits the Spartan incursion under Pleistoanax. He fails altogether to bring out the critical situation in which Pericles found himself in this year. The account of the Samian rebellion which follows tallies with Thucydides, although it illustrates exceptionally well the different style and treatment adopted by Ephorus. One feels in reading Diodorus that he was working from an authority which cared more for the language than the matter: the narrative is not concise and its details are not expressed to their best advantage. Small but interesting points recorded by Thucydides are neglected; while others, whose very precision makes them suspect, are inserted. Moreover, the writer tends to be irrelevant: for example, he men-

¹ Diod. xii. 26; Isoc. *Paneg.* 120. V. also *C.A.H.* v. p. 469 sq. The chapter in Diodorus is a monument of ambiguity. It must be admitted that Thucydides' abrupt account might be made to cover two years.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

tions Artemon's siege-engines; to Thucydides the successful completion of the war is all that matters.¹

When we leave the Pentecontaetia and consider Diodorus on the Peloponnesian War we find much the same state of affairs. The narrative is in agreement with Thucydides on all the outstanding facts; but there are some minor deviations, generally in favour of Athens, and the usual chronological difficulties due to the conflation of Ephorus and Diodorus' list of dates.² Probably Thucydides' monumental work overshadowed any other authorities, and Ephorus relied upon him for the whole period; it is a pity that Holzapfel's conclusion that Ephorus used an auxiliary source, and that this accounts for his occasional misstatements, cannot be carried beyond the region of probability;³ but it is impossible to prove, because such points of divergence as there are might equally have been due to Ephorus' own partisan spirit. The strongest argument which he advances rests on Ephorus' direct refutation of Thucydides' statement that the Athenians broke the truce when they sent thirty ships to help the Argives. Thucydides amplifies this by showing that they had already offered great provocation to Sparta by frequent raiding in the Peloponnese. Ephorus, on the other hand, makes no mention of the raids, and asserts that the Spartans violated the truce at Alcibiades' instigation.⁴ Admittedly, the simplest ex-

¹ Diod. xii. 5-7, 27-28; Thuc. i. 114-117. Diodorus' chapters are interspersed with accounts of the laws of Charondas, Zaleucus, and the Twelve Tables.

² V. Appendix IX.

³ *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*, ch. II.

⁴ Diod. xiii. 8; Thuc. vi. 105 and vii. 18.

planation is to assume a separate tradition—perhaps also due to fourth-century prejudice against Sparta—which had its origin in some unimportant political pamphlet; but we cannot be sure that Ephorus was above its invention.¹

The details of the Sicilian expedition correspond very closely with Thucydides, and it must be admitted that Holzapfel's argument for traces of bias finds but small support in the text.² Indeed, from this point Diodorus' narrative does not disclose any further instances of the omission or alteration of facts in Athens' interests. The Pentecontaetia was a period which badly needed a competent historian, and the lack of a careful record goes some way to explain the cases of extreme disagreement which we have observed between Ephorus and Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War, on the other hand, had its historian, and Ephorus, apart from one unpardonable mistake, seems to have accepted his account. From the point at which Thucydides breaks off there is an abundance of authorities; no less than three, Xenophon, Theopompus and Cratippus, are known to have written continuations of his work. This fact alone tended to secure a higher percentage of truth. Moreover, Ephorus was on the point of recording events which happened in his own lifetime, and the judgment of contemporaries cannot altogether be disregarded.

¹ Cf. Diod. i. 39, 13. Although the hypothesis of a separate authority would suit the un-Thucydidean account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War, it will be seen (*v. next chapter*) that Ephorus was there using a popular tradition, and not the work of another historian.

² *Op. cit.* ch. iv.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

It is interesting to notice that only on three occasions does Ephorus censure Athens, and it is significant that two of them occurred after Thucydides had forsaken him. The first is a typical contrast between the Spartan generosity in liberating the helots who had accompanied Brasidas and the ruthless Athenian punishment of Scione. The others are both condemnations of the extreme democratic party. The temptation is strong to believe that this prejudice emanated from the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*; and that this is yet another indication of Ephorus' position as an intermediary between him and Diodorus.¹

The examination of Diodorus for the years 411-341 proves that Ephorus had a reasonably good account of the events of the period. We have already noted that there is no violent and partisan distortion of the narrative, although a strong anti-Spartan feeling is deeply interwoven in its texture. The subject of Sparta's severe treatment of her allies recurs again and again, and is adduced as the only reason for her eventual downfall. Thus she lost her empire through unjust actions (xiv. 2); the allies' resentment is noted as an explanation of the alliance made against her at the commencement of the Corinthian War (xiv. 82); and in the preface to xv Ephorus justifies his ἐπιτίμησις on the ground that the Spartans by their harsh methods of control had thrown away a supremacy, bequeathed from one generation to another for five centuries. Further, in the list of famous

¹ Censure of Cleophon (xiii. 53, 1), and of the demos for executing the generals after Arginusae (xiii. 102, 4). For the connection with the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* v. p. 123.

men which accompanies the eulogy of Epaminondas, only one Spartan, Agesilaus, appears (xv. 88); and lastly, the frequent reference to the excellent qualities of the Athenian demos is used to point the moral of Sparta's failure. Athens, for example, wins the goodwill of Greece by prohibiting cleruchies, the "goodness of the people" appears in their grant of citizenship to the dispossessed Plataeans, and—greatest tribute of all—their "magnanimity and generosity" (μεγαλόψυχος καὶ φιλόνητος) even prompted them to respond to the Spartan appeal for assistance in 369.¹

On the other hand Ephorus appears to have adopted an impartial attitude towards Thebes; for while he admires the greatness of Pelopidas and Epaminondas, he is not altogether in agreement with Theban actions in the Peloponnese. Such is the general impression which his description of Epaminondas' campaign conveys. Busolt (*Griech. Gesch.* II. p. 106), who has maintained the opposite view, namely that a secondary bias is observable on behalf of Thebes, bases this on the encomia on the two generals. It is, however, an incorrect assumption; for Ephorus' panegyrics were a literary artifice, used merely to demonstrate his particular view of history. In any case, the neutral tone of Diodorus' narrative is quite in accordance with the view attributed to

¹ Diod. xv. 29 (but he forgets to mention the cleruchies in Thrace twelve years later), xv. 46, xv. 63. Other passages are xiv. 6 and xiv. 33, and perhaps Sparta's friendship with Persia and Dionysius (xv. 23): cf. *F.G.H.* F. 211. Bruchmann, "Beiträge zur Ephorus-Kritik, II", pp. 3-8, suggests that the anti-Spartan bias appears early in Ephorus' work: his account of the early history of Elis is definitely in favour of Elis and against Sparta. *V.* also F. 118, p. 74.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Ephorus by Strabo (F. 119): that Boeotia as a country was admirably situated for empire, but for cultural and social reasons was unable to attain more than a transient glory. Further evidence against Busolt may be found in the fact that the valour of both Spartans and Thebans is recognised in the battle descriptions, which, if they are far from being tactical successes, present at least a straightforward and unbiased account of the main incidents.¹

Book XVI, which is concerned mainly with the reign of Philip and the Sacred War, has nothing to offer as a guide to Ephorus' sympathies. He does not hail Philip as the generalissimo of the Greek world against the barbarians, as we might have expected in a student of Isocrates, nor, on the contrary, does he regard Athens as a possible upholder of Greek independence against the power of Macedon. Perhaps this lack of partisan spirit is yet another indication that he had no time to elaborate the rough outline of this book. However, we have already gathered enough evidence to enable us to form an adequate estimate of the extent to which his partiality entered into his work; but before we can assess its harmful influence, it is necessary to turn aside for a fuller consideration of the principle with which it is intimately connected, namely the arbitrary distribution of praise or censure on the lives of great men.

Ephorus, like most ancient historians, adopted a utilitarian view of history, and his pragmatism expressed

¹ xv. 56, where there is a misstatement of the number of Spartan dead at Leuctra—4000—is not anti-Spartan bias; Diodorus is really including all the Peloponnesian troops. For the impossibility of Ephorus' numbers, see Appendix X.

itself in the conviction that the first principle of historiography was the edification of the reader; this he intended to secure by exalting virtue, and magnifying vice. It is easy to discern the reflected glory of this theme in the first sixteen books of Diodorus, and to smile at his pathetic attempts to sustain it when Ephorus' inspiration was no longer at hand. It is in the earlier part of his work that the best examples of Ephorus' aims are to be found. "History", he says in the preface to book I, "must be regarded as the guardian of the virtues of famous men, as the witness to the wrongdoing of the wicked, and as the benefactress of the whole human race." It has more power than all the stories of punishment in Hades to produce fair and honourable conduct; for the deeds of good men live for ever, "voiced by the holy tongue of history" (διαβώμεναι τῷ θειοτάτῳ τῆς ἱστορίας στόματι). The historian's special prerogative is freedom of speech (παρρησία, xv. 1); and it is his privilege to proclaim the truth and confer immortal renown.¹ Diodorus, therefore, made it his constant rule to increase the reputation of the good, and to award due censure to the bad.² It is Ephorus who is speaking; it remains for us to see how this principle was applied.

Not all the famous men mentioned in xv. 88 seem to have had a panegyric allotted to them, but Diodorus does preserve seven instances in which he has devoted one or more chapters to this theme. Several have already been

¹ XIV. 1: τὴν ἀλήθειαν μετὰ παρρησίας κηρύττουσαν, and xv. 1: τῷ διὰ τῆς δόξης ἀθανασισμῷ.

² XI. 46: ἡμεῖς παρ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν εἰωθότες τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν διὰ τῶν ἐπιλεγόμενων ἐπαίνων αὔξειν τὴν δόξαν, τοῖς δὲ φαύλοις . . . ἐπιφθέγγεσθαι τὰς ἀρμοζούσας βλασφημίας. *V.* also xv. 88.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

mentioned: notably, the fulsome praise of Myronides' victory at Oenophyta, and the encomia on Themistocles and Epaminondas. In addition, there is the praise of Aristides, to which is appended as a contrast the censure of Pausanias, and further encomia on Pelopidas and the heroes of Thermopylae. It is interesting to note the particular vices or virtues which attracted Ephorus' attention: the moderation and generosity of Epaminondas, the honesty of Aristides, the patriotism of Themistocles, the self-sacrifice of Leonidas, and last, but not least, the extravagant and foolish self-indulgence of Pausanias.¹ The great men were not all Athenians, but a careful reading of Diodorus leaves no doubt that the scales were heavily weighted against Sparta.

It will be remembered that the cult of rhetoric has been suggested as a hidden reason for these displays of literary brilliance, and certainly they leave with the reader merely an impression of artificial and ineffective writing. Laqueur, in an examination of Ephorus' characters, has remarked that they are out of relation with their author, and that from a reading of Diodorus one cannot discover that Ephorus had any interest in their creation or existence.² Actually Laqueur is speaking of Ephorus as a politician, or rather as a political historian, than whom, as we shall see, no one could show less insight or imagination; but his words can equally well be applied to him as a panegyrist.

¹ The passages referred to are: Thermopylae: xi. 11; Pausanias and Aristides: xi. 46-47; Themistocles: xi. 58-59; Myronides: xi. 82; Pelopidas: xv. 81; Epaminondas: xv. 88.

² *Hermes*, xli. p. 347; *F.G.H.* T. 23, n.

BIAS IN EPHORUS

Thus the petty squabbles of Cyme, the fame of Athens, and prejudice against Sparta, combined with this system of edifying instruction, all did their best to pervert the course of history. The worst examples come from the Pentecontaetia: in particular the Athenian expedition to Egypt, and the events introductory to the Peace of Callias. Against them, however, must be set the rest of Diodorus' narrative down to 341; a narrative which, in spite of its abridged form and notorious cases of bad joining, still preserves a fairly accurate record of events. Perhaps it would be found, if more of the Histories were extant to fill the gaps in Diodorus, that Ephorus was more sinned against than sinning. Certainly Wilamowitz' assessment of his value, evidently made with special reference to the facts we have been discussing, is too severe. "He took care that the moral and patriotic feelings of the public should in the end receive the satisfaction which they expect in the fifth act of a bad tragedy." Polybius, after all, was a creditable historian, and his judgment of Ephorus was on the whole a favourable one. But both he and Thucydides believed in the instructional value of their work: it was Ephorus' misfortune that he lived in an age when the pragmatic historian was also a rhetorician.¹

¹ Wilamowitz, *Greek Historical Writing*, p. 10. Cf. Polyb. XII. 28, 10 quoted on p. 150.

CHAPTER VII

THE CAUSES OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

IN the twelfth book of Diodorus a passage occurs which is of the greatest importance for the study of Ephorus and the assessment of the value of his work. After describing the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra, and the Athenian intervention on the latter's behalf, he reaches the point at which Thucydides' history begins (xii. 37). Here he pauses to describe the causes of the Peloponnesian War. Its origin was probably a stock subject of discussion which was interpreted according to the varying political views of the time. Perhaps it was a fashion set by Thucydides, and imitated with different results by later historians. However that may be, the passage in Diodorus is important, partly because he adopts exactly the opposite view-point to Thucydides, and partly because it is one of the few occasions on which he expressly says that he is following Ephorus.¹ A brief analysis of its contents is as follows:

(1) Pericles, who had been entrusted with the moneys of the Delian Confederacy, found himself unable to give an account of his expenditure, and was advised by his nephew, Alcibiades, to find means of avoiding an in-

¹ He mentions Ephorus by name fifteen times, and six times admits that he follows him. The passage on the Peloponnesian War is the longest.

THE CAUSES OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

vestigation. It occurred to him that the safest way was to involve the Athenians in war (38).

(2) Diodorus proceeds, not to a description of the outbreak of the war, but to a completely disconnected account of the various charges brought by the enemies of Pericles against his friends, Pheidias and Anaxagoras, and his implication in their guilt. Again he decides to baffle their attack by causing a war (39. 1-3).

(3) At this point Diodorus becomes still more disconnected, and presupposing, but not explaining, the existence of the Megarian decree, he describes how Pericles advised the people to accept Sparta's threat of hostilities, and encouraged them with a review of their resources, both financial and military (39. 4-40. 5).

(4) He concludes with the remark that Pericles easily persuaded them by his eloquence, and quotes lines from Eupolis and Aristophanes' *Peace* apparently in support of his statements. "Such were the causes, according to Ephorus, of the Peloponnesian War" (40. 6-41. 1).

The obvious lack of connection between paragraphs 1 and 2, and 2 and 3, had led critics to suspect that Diodorus was dealing with more than one source, and this suspicion is increased by the discovery of a discrepancy between the first and third sections: in the Alcibiades legend the funds of the Delian League amount to 8000 talents, whereas in Pericles' speech they have grown to 10,000, a figure which is supported by a later chapter (54. 3).¹

¹ It is significant that ch. 54, which rebukes Athens for desiring to conquer Sicily, savours of Isocrates' dislike of an overseas empire.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

As will be seen from the note below, the reversal of the first and last sentences of paragraph 2 divides the whole passage into two clearly defined sections, paragraph 1 and paragraphs 2-4. This implies that Diodorus was compiling from two separate authorities.¹ As Vogel, who seems to have been the first to make this discovery, points out, the reference to Ephorus in paragraph 4 suggests that he is responsible for the second part of the narrative: although it is impossible to agree with him that Ephorus treated Pericles more kindly than the author of the first paragraph, and that this is further witness to Diodorus' conflation.²

These chapters of Diodorus, therefore, provide excellent material for a criticism of Ephorus, for they disclose his method of approach to an important problem and illustrate his choice of authorities. We have assumed from the close similarity between his account and Thucydides' that he followed the latter fairly closely in his description of the Peloponnesian War, and that such divergences as exist were due largely to his own enthusiasm for Athens: the theory of the existence of a secondary, and pro-Athenian, source is mere hypothesis.³ In these circumstances, from what authority did Ephorus

¹ The sentence which attempts to connect 1 and 2 (πρὸς δὲ ταύτην... αὐτίκας) would clearly make much better sense (assuming that αὐτίκας was substituted for the plural) as the link between 2 and 3, in the place of the sentence (μηδ' ἔχῃ... λόγον) which really belongs to the Alcibiades story. Such an arrangement does at least connect the Megarian decree more logically with the preceding paragraph. *F.G.H.* F. 196 n.

² Vogel, *Rhein. Mus.* XLIV. p. 523 sq.

³ There is, of course, the possibility of a writer of memoirs, such as Ion, or Stesimbrotus' popular biography "Concerning Themistocles, Thucydides and Pericles".

THE CAUSES OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR
derive his extraordinary account of the beginning of the war?

It is now recognised that Thucydides' theory of its causation (τοὺς Ἀθηναίους... φόβον παρέχοντας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀναγκάσαι ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν, I. 23, 6), which is the leitmotiv of his whole work, leaves on one side some personal elements, which were popularly supposed to have given rise to the war. There was undoubtedly a party at Athens which did its utmost to discredit Pericles during the years preceding the outbreak of hostilities, and to its political intrigues the attacks on Pheidias and Anaxagoras must be ascribed. But it has been established with reasonable certainty that they cannot be connected chronologically with the war, for Anaxagoras had left Athens perhaps twenty years, and Pheidias certainly five years, before Archidamus invaded Attica.¹ Moreover, it is incredible that Pericles' position was insecure when he became the popular spokesman against Sparta and advised the refusal of her demands.

Plutarch's *Life of Pericles* (31-32), which gives in greater detail the tradition preserved by Ephorus, supports the latter's belief in the personal origin of the war. If his occasional use of Ephorus' Histories may be regarded as established, it is at least a probable assumption that his account was drawn ultimately from the same source as Diodorus'. In that event, Diodorus abridged

¹ C.A.H. v. p. 477 sq. Mr H. T. Wade-Gery has recently attacked this argument (J.H.S. LII. ii. p. 220). He would connect the prosecution of Anaxagoras with the return in 433 of Thucydides, the son of Melesias, from his ostracism. If his view is accepted, we may admit that Ephorus was right in his chronology, but wrong in his theory of the causes of the war.

his authority considerably; for he has omitted the Aspasia episode and the decrees of Dracontides and Hagnon. Apart from Plutarch, the well-known quotations from Aristophanes' *Peace* and *Acharnians* present the same point of view: and one is not altogether disposed to accept at its face value the assertion of the chorus and Trygaeus that they had never heard these scandalous stories before.¹ Aristophanes' remark would make a more palpable hit as an allusion to some popular opinion.

The source of the Aristophanes-Ephorus-Plutarch tradition must be discovered before we can turn to the discussion of its treatment by Ephorus. As far as the extant literature shows, it is useless to search for it in the Isocratean school; for the references to Pericles in Isocrates' speeches are purely laudatory. Thus, on one occasion (*Περὶ Ειρήνης*, 126), he praises his care of the state finances in contrast with later demagogues in words which could be interpreted as a direct refutation of the personal scandals [*οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον χρηματισμὸν ὥρμησεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν οἶκον ἐλάττω τὸν αὐτοῦ κατέλιπεν ἢ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς παρέλαβεν*]; and on another (*Περὶ τοῦ Ζεύγους*, 28) he speaks in the highest terms of his moral character (*σωφρονέστατον—δικαιοτάτον—σοφώτατον*). Ephorus was not, therefore, influenced by Isocrates in this part of his work.² On the other hand,

¹ *Peace*, 603 sq.; *Ach.* 524 sq. The chorus' remark (*Peace*, 617-618: οὐδ' ἔγωγε πλὴν γε νυνί, . . . πολλὰ γ' ἡμᾶς λανθάνει) appears to be ironical. Was Aristophanes claiming novelty of expression, but not of sentiment?

² Nor again, apparently, in Diod. xii. 46, where a summary description of his character is given in conjunction with the notice of his death. *V.* also *Περὶ Ἀντιδόσεως*, 234.

THE CAUSES OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

we have the testimony of Aristophanes, which, if our interpretation of the Trygaeus passage is correct, demonstrates the existence of the popular stories perhaps within four years of Pericles' death.¹ The opinion of the present writer is that they were current propaganda considerably before the beginning of the war, and that they were passed by less reputable writers than Thucydides into the hands of fourth-century historians. Thus, the comparatively unknown writer Aristodemus, who flourished towards the end of that period, produced a "contaminated" version of Thucydides and Ephorus (?) on this same problem: he also included the full quotations from Aristophanes.²

It remains to sum up on the basis of the above evidence our view of Ephorus' ability. Jacoby has rightly observed his incompetence, in preferring such a biased account to that of Thucydides, in abandoning the latter at an important point in his narrative, and in not attempting to reconcile the one version with the other so as to produce a balanced theory. Moreover he neglected to verify the dates of the prosecutions of Pericles' friends, a fault which cannot be excused by his particular system of arrangement. Aristophanes' verses appear to have been the source of his information, which turns out to be merely an amplification of their contents. It is strange that one who viewed fifth-century history as the scene of the constant rivalry between Sparta and Athens, and who saw in Cimon's dismissal from Ithome the beginnings of disaster in Greece, should have neglected this

¹ The *Acharnians* was produced in 425, the *Peace* in 421.

² *F.G.H.* 104, F. 16 and note. *V.* also p. 96, n. 1.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

theme at the time of its most important manifestation. Ephorus' uncritical approach to his sources appears to be inexplicable. We have seen that his account was certainly not a product of Isocrates' school: nor did he regard it as an opportunity to moralise. Was it that the strength of the tradition far outweighed Thucydides' single, impersonal estimate? Polybius, who has much to say in criticism of Ephorus' work, evidently accepted his authority here; and perhaps the fact that Isocrates thought it necessary to controvert a very unhistorical legend is evidence of its popularity. Further, the verdict of the fourth century was probably on the side of Ephorus. If this is so, we must attribute it largely to the influence of the cult of rhetoric. It was not that literary skill automatically precluded historical ability; but it did tend to dull the instinct for critical investigation by stressing the presentation of facts to the reader rather than their collection in the interests of truth. From the rhetor's point of view, a collection of popularly accredited stories would be as valuable as a piece of detached historical narrative. But it is little to Ephorus' credit that he had not the ability to distinguish gossip from history.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

THE elucidation of Ephorus' sources depends largely upon the ability to trace points of agreement or divergence between his work and that of other writers, a task which has already been partly accomplished in a preceding chapter. The close connection between the narratives of Diodorus and Thucydides for the period 433-411 has been accepted as evidence of Ephorus' use of the latter. Holzapfel's suggestion of a separate authority to account for the deviations has been discussed, and it was thought improbable that his assumption was necessary; for, with the exception of the passage on the origin of the Peloponnesian War to which we have already referred, the deviations are explicable on the ground of pro-Athenian bias in Ephorus. On the other hand, the gross discrepancies in the *Pentecontaetia* argue, if not an actual Athenian source, a writer who was interested in the glorification of Athens. Ephorus is known to have used the works of Hellanicus for the earlier portions of Greek history; and it is just possible that his book on Attica which Thucydides mentions was the source of Ephorus' information.¹ Otherwise we have to assume one of the numerous writers of *Atthides*, perhaps later than

¹ Thuc. i. 97, 2. He describes it as written βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Thucydides. It is significant that Ephorus neglected the latter's account, when he must have found in his words the implication that no competent historian had previously concerned himself with this period.

According to Ephorus' own declared principle, he decided not to attempt an account of Greek events prior to the historical era, which began for him with the Return of the Heracleidae. Presumably the same rule was applied to the rest of the world, particularly as he considered the barbarians to be older. It is therefore for the period between the beginning of the tenth century and the Pentecontaetia that we have to discover his authorities, a period which was dealt with in books I-X. Of these, two were concerned with world-geography, two more with the history of the East, and the remainder with events in Greece and the western Mediterranean. Apart from the Dorian conquest of the Peloponnese, which must have tormented Ephorus a good deal as a lover of truth, a large part of books II and III must have been devoted to long accounts of the foundation and growth of the more important Greek states. Thus, to give an example, Strabo quotes two lengthy passages, which probably occurred originally in close connection, describing the naming of Aetolia after Aetolus who was driven out of Elis by the Epeians, but who was restored through his friendship with the Heracleidae: Elis was dedicated to Zeus, and in time the Olympian festival was established. Incidentally, in connection with the foundation of Elis by Oxylus Ephorus quoted two inscriptions which had been set up in Elis and Aetolia to commemorate the event. Unfortunately, it did not occur to him that they must

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

have been set up long afterwards, and that their evidence was therefore worthless.¹ Another excellent example is his description of Boeotia (F. 119), which opens with the singularly happy remark on its advantageous position commanding three seas, and reveals its early history in the activities of Cadmus, the Epigonoι and the legends connected with the Pelasgian invasion. More significant, however, for our present purpose are F. 117, 118, which record the history of Sparta before the era of Lycurgus. These quotations are important for two reasons: they illustrate Ephorus' method of treating an obscure subject like the Dorian invasion, and give a reference to an historian who may have been partly responsible for his information. Strabo relates how two of the Heracleidae, Eurysthenes and Procles, divided Laconia into six parts, over each of which they placed "kings"; the origin of the term "helot" is explained by the story that Agis, Eurysthenes' son, deprived the surrounding people (περίοικοι) of their equality of status with the Spartans; whereupon the Heleians, who inhabited Helos, revolted and were reduced to the position of slaves (δούλους ἐπὶ τὰκτοῖς τισιν). The original inhabitants of Laconia were Achaeans, who were persuaded to migrate to Ionia by their Dorian conquerors:² hence the name "Achaean Argos" sometimes given to Sparta (apparently by Homer!). The new settlers were well governed, but after

¹ F. 115 and 122; *v.* also Bruchmann, "Beiträge z. Eph.-Kritik, II", pp. 3-4.

² Ephorus does not see the contradiction when he states (three lines later) that the Dorians offered homes in Laconia to those who wished to stay there—διὰ τὴν λαπεωνδρίαν. *V.* also F.G.H. Helanicus, 4, F. 188.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

they had entrusted the constitution to Lycurgus, they excelled all the others and became the rulers of Greece until Thebes robbed them of their hegemony. Hellanicus attributes the new constitution to Eurysthenes and Procles, and thereby incurs Ephorus' rebuke. For Ephorus, Lycurgus was the beginning of Sparta's glory, and all her institutions must be ascribed to him (*v. F.* 149); and he has unimpeachable evidence in the document written by King Pausanias himself against Lycurgus' laws, in which he records the oracles given to Lycurgus on the subject of his new state.

For the question of Ephorus' sources and his use of them this document is of great value. Pausanias went into exile in 395 because, after Lysander's defeat and death at Haliartus and his own ignominious retirement from Boeotia, he had been accused by his brother-king, Agesilaus, and condemned to death for declining battle with the Thebans.¹ Pausanias probably attacked the power of the *gerousia* and the *ephors* which limited the authority of the king. Here was first-hand information on a subject of the greatest antiquity and interest. It has already been seen that the discussion of the best constitution, involving the comparison of the forms of government attributed to Sparta and Crete, was common in the literature of the fourth century. The political document of Pausanias formed part of the material for such discussions; and to it Ephorus owed his views on Lycurgus, if not on most of early Spartan history, for there is no saying how far Pausanias went back to prove

¹ He seems to have been a philo-Athenian; perhaps this was another reason; cf. his activities in 403.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

his case. It is thus valuable evidence of Ephorus' choice of authorities.¹

A second point of interest which arises in connection with the two passages is the reputation of Hellanicus. It shows that at least Ephorus had read his work, although he does not seem to have made use of it here; for he differs in his account of the origin of the helots. Hellanicus discovered in them the Achaeans who were captured by the Dorians and were reduced to the position of serfs. For our appreciation of Ephorus it is worth noting that he makes no effort to define exactly the relation of the perioikoi to Sparta; and perhaps the division of the country into six regions is only a reflection of the well-known divisions of the Spartan army after the Peloponnesian War. In addition, he disagrees both with Herodotus and Thucydides in his statement that Sparta experienced a period of peaceful development before the time of Lycurgus; for Thucydides speaks of Sparta as ἐπὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον στασιάζουσα (I. 18, 1), and Herodotus of her inhabitants as being κακονομώτατοι σχεδὸν πάντων Ἑλλήνων (I. 65, 2). Thus the rejection of the three historians as possible authorities for Ephorus lends some support to the theory of a single use of Pausanias.

We have next to trace the relationship between Ephorus and Herodotus. A passage which proves his interest in the older historian's work occurs in Diodorus x. 24, 1. Herodotus in his characteristic way had doubts of the

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 173-175 n. Perhaps Stenyclaros' synoecism of Messene is also due to fourth-century discussion of the Messene-Spartan problem. *V. F.* 116.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

truth of one of his stories, which Ephorus had repeated and maintained as correct. It is in allusion to this that he asserts that extraordinary stories do contain the truth, although his remark is not intended as an attack on Herodotus.¹ An examination of the fragments in Jacoby seems to indicate a lack of connection between the two writers. For example, Ephorus' account of the Scythians, and in particular of Anacharsis (F. 24), appears to be entirely independent of Herodotus' narrative (iv. 76). Thus the latter had no knowledge at all of Anacharsis as one of the Seven Wise Men, or of his invention of fire, the double anchor and the potter's wheel.² Actually it is highly probable that this information was derived from Hecataeus; for the mention of Anacharsis in a passage dealing with the Scythians leads to its connection with the two geographical books, iv and v, which undoubtedly owed much to the Ionian cartographer.³ He was the first to write a description of the world which began with the Pillars of Hercules and worked eastwards through Europe until it returned through Asia, Egypt and Africa to its starting-point; this too was the system which Ephorus followed. Moreover, a remark of Pliny's (F. 172) is useful as an indication that Hecataeus was his sole authority. The *Periplus* of Hanno was written c. 460, from which

¹ Cf. Herod. vii. 152, 3: ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαι γὰρ μὲν οὐ παντάπασι δόξω. V. also F.G.H. F. 180, which mentions Herodotus and the Lydian historian Xanthus.

² Diod. ix. 6 followed Ephorus' account; cf. also F. 115 with Herod. vi. 127, 3, where Ephorus goes beyond Herodotus in ascribing the invention of coins to Pheidon.

³ V. notes to F. 30, 42, 158, 184-189. Jacoby suggests that minor deviations from Hecataeus are due to Ephorus' use of a later copy of his work.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

it is known that his expedition sailed westwards from the Straits of Gibraltar along the African coast to establish trading stations. The furthest point reached was an island named Cerne. According to Pliny, Ephorus described this island as situated in the Red Sea, not far from the coast of Aethiopia. He knew nothing, therefore, of the Carthaginian travel-narrative, and it would appear that he was writing from a source which had, perhaps, been prevented by the Carthaginian principle of a *mare clausum* from penetrating far into the western Mediterranean.¹

Ephorus, therefore, did not depend on Herodotus alone for the earlier history, and Schwartz (P.W. "Eph." col. 15) has shown that he has many points of disagreement in his account of the period of the Persian Wars. It is unnecessary in view of Schwartz's investigation to give details of many instances. Diodorus (xi. 31, 3) appears to connect the storming of the Persian camp at Plataea with Artabazus' retreat: Herodotus (ix. 66) explains Artabazus' stratagem for avoiding the battle, and implies that he carried it out from the start. He also has no report of Pausanias' order to put all the Persians to death (Diod. xi. 32, 5). Fragments 63, 64, which are known definitely to belong to the tenth and eleventh books of the Histories, contain certain references to the story of Miltiades' fine, and its payment by his son Cimon after a successful marriage. Diodorus (x. 30) is of value for supplementing Ephorus' account; and it is noteworthy that Herodotus (vi. 136) had no knowledge of that part of the story which told of Cimon's imprisonment and

¹ V. F.G.H. F. 172 n., and Appendix IV.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

marriage. Finally, while Ephorus and Herodotus agree that Plataea and Mycale were fought on the same day, the latter has no suspicion of the compact between Persia and Carthage to attack both ends of the Greek world at the same time.¹

To what source did Ephorus owe these frequent deviations? Partly perhaps to Hellanicus, and certainly to Ctesias. The points of similarity between the surviving fragments of the latter's work and Diodorus xi are summed up in Schwartz's article.² It is uncertain, however, whether Ephorus used Ctesias direct. Jacoby, remarking on the romantic account of Themistocles' flight, suggests that at least the Persian part of the story originated in the popular histories of Asia Minor and the Persian Empire (Περσικά). After leaving Admetus' court Themistocles fled to his friend Lysitheidēs in Asia, who happened to be on good terms with Xerxes, and had feasted the whole Persian army on its way to Greece. Themistocles requested him to conduct him to the king's court, and Lysitheidēs, knowing his unpopularity with the Persians, contrived to have him carried thither secretly (ὥσπερ πολλοκλήν). Fortunately Xerxes accepted his argument that he had done no wrong; but suddenly

¹ Cf. Diod. xi. 35 with Herod. ix. 100, and xi. 1, 4 with vii. 165. But both agree in attributing Xerxes' expedition to Mardonius' instigation. (Diod. xi. 1, 3; Herod. vii. 5, 2.) Bauer (*Die Benutzung Herodots durch Ephoros bei Diodor*) gives many instances of close resemblance between Herodotus and Diodorus. But our present purpose is to discover points of divergence which show a partial use of some other source.

² Ctesias, and perhaps Xanthus, were used for the history of the East (v. *F.G.H.* F. 58-62 n., and von Christ, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* i. 1, p. 704, n. 9). The use of Ctesias is also well supported by the article of Mess, *Rhein. Mus.* lxi. p. 361 sq.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

Mandane, the king's sister, demanded vengeance. He was tried (after he had been granted enough time to learn Persian) and acquitted—to Xerxes' great satisfaction. Amongst other rewards he was presented with three cities and a Persian wife, and lived happily till his death at Magnesia. To this Ephorus appended a divergent account evidently intended to point the moral of Themistocles' patriotism for the last time. It is that Xerxes wished him to join in another expedition against Greece, but he gallantly avoided the obligation by a draught of bull's blood. Then follows the eulogy to which we have previously referred.

This story has been given in detail because it is the best of several examples in Diodorus of a source of information to which Ephorus had frequent recourse.¹ The literature of the *Persica* and *Atticides*, belonging more to the fourth than the fifth century, was the embodiment, not of historical fact, but of the popular legends which easily accumulate around the personalities of great men. In it were to be found the proverbs, oracles, well-known quotations from the poets, and even copies of fictitious inscriptions of which Ephorus himself offers such a good collection.² The obvious opportunity it provided for adventures in mendacity would have made any competent historian disregard its existence; but for Ephorus it took its place with the most accurate records

¹ Other instances are—Gelon and Demarete (xi. 26); Epaminondas' two daughters (xv. 87); Diomedes' horses (xiii. 74); v. also xiii. 106, 9; xii. 74, 3. Alcibiades' advice to Pericles came from a similar source (xii. 38). V. also Holzapfel, *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*, ch. viii.

² V. p. 127 sq.

of the past, and stories drawn from its compendium of truth and falsehood were inserted indiscriminately in his work. The direct results have already been observed in the account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War.

Polybius has remarked that Ephorus was the best of the Greek historians on the subject of the foundation of states, colonies and blood-relationships, and that he avoided genealogies (T. 18). We have already seen something of his interest in the early history of Elis, Aetolia and Boeotia; and we have also seen that he disagreed with Hellanicus' view of the early Spartan constitution, although his explanation of the term "helot" is substantially the same.¹ Amongst Hellanicus' works were books dealing with the history of individual states, in which he attempted to construct a dated and unbroken series of events from the time of the state's founding. To ascertain the names of the founders he doubtless referred to genealogies which were already in existence; but he gained a reputation amongst later writers as an authority in this branch of learning (κρίσεις). It is more than a probable assumption that he must be counted as one of Ephorus' sources, although not the only one, for the events of the mythical period.² Thus the list of the founders of towns in the Peloponnese (F. 18) is likely to be under his influence; and perhaps he is the ultimate source of some of the frequent references in the geography

¹ *F.G.H.* Hellanicus, 4, F. 188 (Harpocration): εἰλωτες γὰρ οἱ μὴ γόνῳι δοῦλοι Λακεδαιμονίων, ἀλλ' οἱ πρῶτοι χειρωθέντες τῶν Ἑλῶς τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων...ὥς Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τῇ α.

² *F.G.H.* F. 226.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

written by Stephanus of Byzantium.¹ For the reader who is disinclined for probabilities, there is still Josephus' statement that Ephorus pointed out very many mistakes in Hellanicus (T. 30). This indicates at least a close reading of his material.

Passing over the Pentecontaetia and the Thucydidean section of the Peloponnesian War we reach the last seventy years of Ephorus' history. This is a period which offers peculiar difficulty for the investigation of his authorities, because the only historian, whose works have come down to us in their entirety, happens to be the very one whom he did not follow. Our study of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* has left the conviction that Ephorus availed himself of its material for the events of the years 396-395. Since it has been established on the internal evidence of the papyrus that its author also dealt with certain incidents in the Decelean War, which took place just after the point at which Thucydides' narrative terminated, it is tempting to believe that Ephorus had it before him for the whole of this period. We have already remarked on its correspondence with Diodorus: we should expect its author to condemn the rejection of the Spartan peace terms after Mindarus' defeat: his good-will to the moderate democratic party is reflected in the pages of Diodorus, and perhaps the use by both writers of the same word (οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς) to describe it is an indication of their close connection; a fact which receives yet

¹ *V. F.G.H. F. 24*: 'Αθῆναι... Διάνατος κτίσμα, ὡς Ἐφορος γ. He would also be useful for the colonies. It is interesting to note the reference to Hellanicus and Ephorus in *F. 40*, which deals with colonisation.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

further support if Volquardsen's argument for the existence in Diodorus of a marked sympathy for Thera-
menes may be accepted.¹ Further, P's narrative disclosed
no signs of the preferential treatment of the Athenians
which was usually a feature of Ephorus' work. Nor again
is there any appearance of this in Diodorus' text. It
seems, therefore, that Ephorus was here working from
an unbiased source, which was probably P. Moreover,
of the three historians who are known to have written
continuations of Thucydides, Xenophon, Theopompus
and Cratippus, the first is ruled out of our consideration
by the certainty that Ephorus was not using his work for
the years 396-395, and did not use him after that time:
in the case of the second, the evidence points against
rather than for him, at least as far as the examination of
the fragments is concerned: while Cratippus, in spite of
the efforts made to transform him into the author of the
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, still remains merely a name.
Thus on the basis of our knowledge of the papyrus, the
hypothesis seems justified that P was in Ephorus' hands
for the period 411-395, although he did not use him for
the expedition of Cyrus, and probably not for his account
of the Thirty.² In any case it is more improbable to
assume that Ephorus turned to him as an authority for
the brief space of two years. How far, however, he was

¹ Volquardsen, *Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor*, pp. 63-64. For the use of the term—οἱ ἑταίροις—see Diod. XIII. 53, 1; XIV. 4, 2; Hell. Oxy. col. I, line 19 sq.

² Busolt's theory should be noted that Ephorus (Diod. XIV. 3-6) and Aristotle took their accounts of the Thirty from the *Atthis* of Androtion, published c. 344 (*Hermes*, XXXIII. p. 76). V. also P.W. I. 2, col. 2173 sq.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

used beyond that point cannot, in the present state of the evidence, be ascertained.

In the belief that the Oxyrhynchus papyrus did not get beyond the battle of Cnidos in 394, it only remains to consider Ephorus' sources for events until the siege of Perinthus. The complete divergence of Diodorus from Xenophon has long been recognised, and their different points of view are in themselves sufficient to establish their independence. The most cursory glance reveals numerous instances of Xenophon's suppressing facts which even Diodorus' abridged version can supply. Thus he presents the Spartan seizure of the Cademea as just a happy thought which occurred to Phoebidas under the walls of Thebes: he suppresses his information about the Spartan cavalry engagement before the battle of Mantinea: and he has little to say of Sparta's control over her allies, and nothing of the amount of money she exacted from them. Not that he is an incompetent historian; for of the two his evidence is the more trustworthy in spite of his philo-Spartan standpoint. Yet the faults and omissions of Diodorus are far more numerous. He gives the most summary account of the immediate result in Thebes of the Spartan occupation: his narrative of the Theban request for help and the despatch of Athenian troops is defective, and, on a comparison with Xenophon's, quite in the wrong:¹ and his descriptions of the tactics employed at Mantinea and Leuctra are valueless except as literary documents. Nevertheless, as is shown in Appendix VII, he can be more accurate than Xenophon; for instance, he is in agreement with

¹ Grote, ix, notes on pp. 307 and 313.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Pausanias, Polybius and Isocrates in the statement that the Spartans broke up Mantinea into its five original villages (xv. 5, 4), in contrast to Xenophon who gives the number as four; and he is probably correct in his assertion that Phoebidas had received secret instructions from the Spartan government to occupy the Cadmea at a favourable opportunity (xv. 20, 2). Similarly Xenophon does not record the death of Alcibiades, who passes out of the narrative after advising the Athenian generals of their dangerous situation at Aegospotami (*Hell.* II. 1, 25). Diodorus gives two versions of his death (xiv. 11); but the credit for these additional details is counterbalanced by the quite improbable story of Alcibiades' request for the command at Aegospotami and the omission of his advice. These few examples can be multiplied almost indefinitely, but are enough to prove the complete independence of the two historians, and therefore of Diodorus' source. In any case we have already established Ephorus' hostility to Sparta and the consequent colouring of his narrative in the interests of Athens; it is incredible that he should have done so as the copyist of Xenophon.¹ Finally, it should be noted that probably not even the famous *Anabasis* was regarded by Ephorus as his chief source for Cyrus' expedition, and there seems to be a studied avoidance even of Xenophon's name. On the contrary, the name of Sophænetus is often mentioned by Diodorus (xiv. 19, 31), and he is known as one of the leaders of the expedition who produced an account of it afterwards. Ctesias has been proposed as Ephorus'

¹ Cf. *Hell.* vi. 5, 33 sq. with Diod. xv. 63, 1-2, where the Spartan appeal to Athens for help is treated in exactly opposite ways.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

authority, and a satisfactory argument has been put forward on his behalf.¹ It is just possible to believe that he in his turn drew on Sophænetus, and that this explains the complete silence about Xenophon, and also the appearance, as even Schwartz has observed, of a fairly accurate narrative. It is interesting to discover from the words—*εἰς τὴν πεδίον . . . οὐδενὸς τῷ κάλλει λειπόμενον* (ch. 20, 2)—that its ultimate authority seems to have been an eyewitness of the places he describes.²

In the probable deviations from the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* we have an illustration of Schwartz's remark, that for the later years of his history Ephorus did not follow a given authority continuously. He appears to have read widely, and no doubt drew much of his information from people he met, or from his own experiences. With one exception, however, it is only possible to indicate the type of literature he may have read. The exception is the historian Callisthenes, and to him we shall return. Scattered throughout the pages of Diodorus are inscriptions and quotations from the poets; for Ephorus, no doubt, the inscriptions were useful evidence, whatever the time of their composition. Thus on the one hand we have the obvious forgeries on the statue-bases of Aetolus and Oxylus (F. 122), and on the other the accurate mention of the gold tripod sent to Delphi after the victory of Plataea.³ The poets,

¹ V. Mess, *op. cit.* p. 360 sq. Ephorus seems to have interpreted Xenophon's narrative in the light of Ctesias' account.

² Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 10, line 47. He notices only one instance of false topography in the description of the Cilician Gates.

³ Diod. xi. 33, 2; and compare the inscription concerning Cimon's victories (xi. 62, 3) with Oxy. Pap. 1610, fr. 48 (v. Grenfell and Hunt's note).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

indeed, could hardly be called evidence; but they had to take their place all the same in Ephorus' work. Hence he quoted Simonides' epitaph, or an odd saying of Empedocles, and even lines from Aristophanes on what should have been rather a solemn occasion.¹ Homer, of course, has to appear as well, particularly in the earlier history. He has an appropriate line which supports the interpretation of "Achaean Argos" as an early name for Sparta (F. 118); and together with Hesiod he is quite an authority on the "milk-drinking" Scythians (F. 42). For the Pelasgian question, too, one can discover numerous useful references! (F. 113). Oracles also are found to have quite a topical interest (F. 56), especially when it was from Athens that Apollo set out to found his shrine at Delphi (F. 31). The last passage illustrates one of the aspects of fourth-century literature—its pseudo-antiquarian interests. Here is the origin of the paean, and of the Delphic ritual; or in other places, of the generic term, Achelous, for water (F. 20 b), and of the common name for rogues, "Eurybati" (F. 58).

More serious, however, but of hardly more value historically, were the tendentious political documents, of which we have already seen an example in Pausanias' attack on the Spartan government. Diodorus evidently knew of another which was found in Lysander's house after his death, and which was also an attack on the hereditary kingship (Diod. xiv. 13, 8); and this is confirmed by Plutarch (F. 207), who, whether he took his

¹ The following references give instances of inscriptions and quotations: Diod. xi. 11, 6; xi. 33, 2; xi. 62, 3; xii. 40, 6; xiii. 41, 3; xiii. 83, 1.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

own account of it from Ephorus or not, attributes his information to him. Neither Diodorus nor Plutarch imply that Lysander obtained oracular consent for his innovations; Nepos, however (*F.G.H.* F. 207 n.), reveals that the document did contain a forged oracle. The work of Isocrates himself was really only the production of political pamphlets, and their injurious effect on the historian's judgment can well be realised by a consideration of the notorious Peace of Callias. It was from the pamphleteers, perhaps, and their rhetorical enthusiasm that Ephorus learned the literary value of such conceptions as cruelty and humanity, virtue and vice; such, too, were the causes of his inability to penetrate behind the scenes in affairs of state, and for his acceptance of the course of events merely at its face value. For he had no political discernment. He was uninterested in internal politics. He was more concerned with the righteous punishment of the revolutionary Ephialtes than with the precise effect of his reforms, or the condition of society which they indicated;¹ and he says nothing of the struggles between Pericles and Cimon, or Nicias and Alcibiades. Democratic and oligarchic movements had for Ephorus no importance either within or without the state: he was aware in its broadest issues of the effect of Themistocles' policy and of its repercussions in the Aegean and Asia Minor: but he was totally unaware of the democratic influence which was responsible for the banishment of Cimon, and the transient Athenian domination of Boeotia. The mind which saw in the

¹ Diod. xi. 77, 6: οὐ μὴν ἀθῶός γε διέφυγε τηλικούτοις ἀνοήμασιν ἐπιβολόμενος, ἀλλὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἀναρρεθεὶς ἔδηλον ἔσχε τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτήν.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Periclean scandals the causes of the Peloponnesian War was equally inappreciative of the significance of the revolution of the Four Hundred: as Diodorus shows,¹ one brief statement records their establishment on the ground that oligarchic government is more reliable in a crisis, and another, equally brief, records their dissolution. Then, and then only, does Alcibiades intrigue with the officers of the fleet at Samos to secure his recall, and Theramenes advises the people to let him return. Perhaps the best instance of all is the motive ascribed to Dionysius I as an explanation of his schemes for planting colonies on the shores of the Adriatic.² It is said that he desired to make the Ionian Gulf a *mare clausum* (τὸν Ἴόνιον πόρον ἰδιοποιεῖσθαι), with safe passages and sheltered harbours. His ultimate objective was the temple at Delphi with whose treasures he hoped to enrich himself. Even the supposed alliance between Carthage and Persia to annihilate the Greek world at one blow does not betray such a superficial judgment. How far it can be attributed to the influence of the pamphleteers cannot be ascertained; but it is certainly no hyperbole to say that Ephorus showed little insight in unravelling the tangled skein of Greek political life.³

¹ Diod. XIII. 36, 2 and 38, 1.

² Diod. xv. 13, 1. Similarly cf. *F.G.H.* F. 211 with Diod. xv. 23, 5. In connection with these two passages is there any significance in the remark which Isocrates puts into the mouth of Archidamus? (Ἀρχίδαμος, 63) ἐπὶ δὲ Διονύσιον τὸν τύραννον καὶ τὸν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν δυνάστας...προθύμως ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπικουρήσοντας.

³ V. Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 8, line 8: "...politische Pläne...konstruiert er wie ein Kannegiesser". Note also the typical personal element in the reasons given for Alcibiades' banishment, especially the story of his quarrel with Diomedes (XIII. 73, 3 sq.).

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

We have already remarked that Callisthenes is the one exception who can be counted fairly definitely as one of Ephorus' sources, perhaps indeed the chief one for the last three decades of his history. His *Hellenica*, written before 335, seems to have taken as its starting-point the appearance of Thebes as an important power from the time of the battle of Leuctra; for the passage quoted by Jacoby (124, F. 8) as belonging to his first book probably refers to the Spartan request to Athens for help after the founding of Messene (370).¹ It was anti-Spartan in sympathy, although it avoided partisanship with Athens; for example, Callisthenes rejected the Peace of Callias as a formal agreement between the Athenians and the Persian king, and explained the disappearance of the Persian fleet from the Aegean as merely due to fear inspired by the Athenian victories in Cyprus (124, F. 16). As Alexander's tutor he upheld Isocrates' view of the Macedonian monarchy as the leader of Greece against Persia, and perhaps this induced a lack of sympathy with the nationalist aspirations of the Greek states. Finally, he made no use at all of Xenophon and almost certainly none of Theopompus.

A quotation from Eusebius ranks Callisthenes amongst Ephorus' authorities:² it is necessary to support this from the extant fragments of the two historians. Their agreement on the date of Troy's fall is useless for our purpose,³ but the evidence of three other passages indicates a strong resemblance of opinion, and the correct-

¹ Kroll's view that it began with the Peace of Antalcidas has no support from the fragments. (P.W. x. 2, col. 1706.)

² F.G.H. T. 17.

³ F.G.H. F. 226.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

ness of Eusebius' statement. Diodorus (xv. 43, 4) explains the retreat of the Persians from Egypt and the failure of their joint expedition with Iphicrates as due to the Nile's floods: these were caused by the Egyptian monsoons (τῶν ἐτησίων ἤδη γενομένων): it is significant that the same phenomenon was mentioned in Callisthenes' fourth book (τοὺς ἐτησίους ἐξωθεῖν τὸν Νεῖλον, 124, F. 12), for which the date 374, ascertained by cross-reference to Diodorus, is especially suitable. Thus Callisthenes' work may have been in Ephorus' hands when he wrote book xxi. Secondly, we have the coincidence of the two accounts of the earthquake which destroyed Helice and Buris, in which both writers appear to have attempted a combination of the theories shared by the "physicists", who argued for a natural explanation of the phenomena, and the "pious", who saw in it the work of the gods.¹ Thirdly, there is an extremely probable connection between Callisthenes, Ephorus and Diodorus in the latter's digression on the early history of Messenia.² To one who knows Ephorus' partiality for digressions, it is not surprising to find this interruption of Diodorus' narrative to recount Messenia's history from the era before the Trojan War, although it is certainly an irrelevant ending to Epaminondas' first Peloponnesian campaign. Ephorus' responsibility is proved by reference to Strabo, who shows that he quoted lines from Tyrtæus commemorating the Spartan victory after seventeen years of warfare. On turning to Callisthenes we find that he also had indulged in an account

¹ Diod. xv. 48-49, F. 212 n., and 124, F. 19-21, notes.

² *F.G.H.* F. 216; Diod. xv. 66; 124, F. 23-24.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

of Messenia's history, which included further lines from Tyrtaeus and an inscription.¹ Incidentally, it should be noticed that both he and Diodorus made the poet an Athenian. From these facts it is not difficult to trace Ephorus' dependence on Callisthenes' work. Doubtless Epaminondas' resettlement of Messene in 370 had considerable sentimental value, and to this we owe Callisthenes' excursus at this point in his history. Ephorus had adopted him beforehand as an authority, and his late digression (which need not postulate the omission of the same facts in the early books²) was due to the sudden discovery of this passage. Probably he also borrowed the verses and inscription, which Diodorus has left out in his shortened version. These three instances, therefore, of correspondence with the fragmentary remains of Callisthenes' *Hellenica* are considered sufficient to place his acceptance as Ephorus' source beyond the region of mere hypothesis. Perhaps he was also the cause of his transference of interest from Greece to Macedon on the accession of Philip. It is a pity that we cannot form an estimate of Callisthenes' ability: to judge from his superior knowledge on the Peace of Callias, he may have been quite a creditable authority.

Let us briefly consider the results of our investigation before we proceed to a criticism of Ephorus. In the earliest period he used Herodotus and Hellanicus, and for the accompanying history of the East, Ctesias, and perhaps the work of Xanthus embodied in later *Persica*;

¹ Wilamowitz (*Die Textgeschichte d. Gr. Lyriker*, pp. 103-104) believes that the inscription was not older than the fifth century.

² Cf. Diod. viii. 27, i.e. if Ephorus is here his authority.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

for the Pentecontaetia a strongly biased Athenian source together with a Persian account of the Themistocles romance; for the Peloponnesian War, largely Thucydides, but under the encroaching influence of the fourth-century pamphleteers; and for the last part of his work probably the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia,¹ and certainly Callisthenes, both of which were further supplemented by the *Persica* and Ctesias. These were his main authorities. We have also mentioned Busolt's suggestion of the *Atthis* of Androtion, which was not the only one of its kind, and the quasi-historical document of Pausanias. In addition, there is the likelihood of an eyewitness account of Cyrus' anabasis, which, although it was not in this particular instance of first-hand authority, gives promise of more evidence of the same type the further we advance into the historian's own time. If Schwartz is right in attributing Diodorus' as well as Plutarch's account of Dion's expedition to the eyewitness report of Timonides of Leucas, we have in this an excellent example of the accurate and useful part such reports may have played in the later portions of Ephorus' history.² Lastly, we have the inscriptions, perhaps not always of much historical value, and the inexhaustible fund of his own literary knowledge.³

¹ Eusebius gives Daimachus as one of Ephorus' sources (T.17). If Jacoby's argument for him as the author of the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia could be accepted, another link in the chain of evidence would be forged.

² P.W. "Eph." col. 10, line 41.

³ It is noteworthy that West and Meritt (*Athenian Financial Documents*, p. 46) in discussing the inscription dealing with the expenses of the Samian War (*I.G.* 1.² 293) succeed in reconciling the epigraphic evidence with the literary (Diod. xii. 28, 3; cf. Isoc.

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

In no case does Ephorus seem to have confined himself to one authority.¹ He had, therefore, plenty of opportunities for exercising the art of criticism. It has been seen that he did not scruple to refute Hellanicus, and he must have known that his theory of the outbreak of war in 431 was directly opposed to 'Thucydides'. He must also have heard of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and of his history which covered the events of half a century, but he preferred to use the work of historians whose reputation has long since passed away. Thus his critical faculty was fundamentally at fault; for, although it inspired him to collect a number of authorities, it rendered him unable to appreciate their varying importance. He could afford to disagree about the date of Troy's destruction (F. 226, n.), or on the ascription of the Spartan constitution to a semi-mythical founder; but he was not entitled to overlook the interaction of political forces, or to accept without scrutiny the transparently untrue causes of individual or corporate activity. Unfortunately this was part of his heritage. Too often he weighed the verdict of his predecessors against the judgment of his contemporaries, and found it wanting. As a critic, genealogies and theogonies excited his just suspicion, and resulted in his determination to seek truth and avoid mythology,² but he found it still impossible to avoid the "epic"

xv. 111). But whether Ephorus took the figures from Isocrates or the actual inscription we cannot say.

¹ Cf. Mess, *op. cit.* p. 406, who remarks on his complex use of sources: "es sind nicht bloss Ausschnitte aus verschiedenen Quellen aneinandergereiht, sondern das Material ist auf das engste ineinandergearbeitet".

² *F.G.H.* F. 31 b: ἐπιτιμήσας τοῖς φιλομυθοῦσιν . . . καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπαινέσας . . .

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

concept of history by starting at the Return of the Heracleidae. The principle of universal history necessarily involved the fusion of two streams of tradition which had been separated in the lifetime of Thucydides. The older and larger of these, sprung from the poets and cosmologers, had spent most of its force by the end of the fifth century, and its energies were being directed into the new channels of local history and pseudo-antiquarian research. It supplied, in fact, the motive power for the less respectable atthidographers and the writers of annals for small country towns—works which often depended less on the ability than on the imagination of their authors. The second and younger stream, perhaps remotely connected with the more critical spirit of the Ionian thinkers, quickly reached its fullness in the writings of Thucydides. The value, however, of his detached standpoint was not appreciated, and his successful effort to make history a science as well as an art was submerged beneath the spate of fourth-century literature. Ephorus claimed to have united these divergent approaches to the study of the past; but the joint was badly concealed under a display of rhetoric, and the union of the two elements was never properly effected. For Ephorus himself, penetrated by the influences of a rhetorical training, was too much a product of his environment. He attached little importance to his authorities if their views were found to differ from the current notions of his own age: of this the Peace of Callias is an outstanding example. At the same time he did not refrain from copying out large sections from the works of others (T. 17), as, for instance, in the case of

THE SOURCES OF THE HISTORIES

the rather overdone digression on Messenia. Moreover, having once selected his authority, he did not think to challenge its guidance; and he never took the precaution of climbing back to a higher level to get a wider prospect of his path. Thus his outlook was characteristic of his source with the exception of his strong Athenian sympathies, and perhaps his authorities were chosen because of their unconscious agreement with his own views. This may be the reason why he studiously avoided Xenophon, preferring a Theban, or even a Macedonian standpoint. Apart from this, he had the capacity to collect material but not to criticise it.

CHAPTER IX

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

IN the course of the preceding chapters we have investigated the main features of the Histories, and reached certain conclusions on Ephorus' historiography. It is now necessary to discuss several minor points of style and method before we are entitled to pass a final judgment on him. In particular, it is useful to recall the opinions formed by those writers who still had his works before them in their entirety; for whether they were historians, biographers, or literary critics, they all had an opportunity of first-hand knowledge which is denied to the modern investigator. As will be seen, their views varied considerably, and were not always impartial; but from their consideration one very definite fact will emerge. Not one of them ever thought to criticise Ephorus adversely for his lack of that most important historical virtue—detachment. To explain this as due to a careless disregard for the truth is an easy misconception; its explanation is rather to be sought in the impossibility of combining this particular virtue with a principle of didacticism, which demands that certain facts should be unnecessarily emphasised. Thus the search for truth becomes essentially didactic if it is pursued for other than its own ends. The desire to bequeath a treasury of political or moral wisdom

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

gathered from the lives and actions of great men is repellent to the modern scientific historian; but to Polybius, Ephorus, and even to some extent Thucydides, it was the life-blood of their work. Perhaps, then, we shall do well to accept the unanimity of his critics, and not judge this particular fault too harshly, especially when it is remembered that, among numerous offenders, he was not the worst.

Amongst the damaging criticisms which have been brought against Ephorus in recent times, one at least has no foundation. In discussing his powers as a writer Schwartz observes that he was the first to introduce the principle of duplicating parts of his narrative—*Verdoppelung*—with which literary artifice he was able to make use of the same language, and occasionally the same thought, in different parts of his work. From the charge of being unoriginal it is but a small step to the belief that he filled the scantier portions of his history with incidents borrowed from previous chapters.¹ It must be said at once that from an unbiased view-point Schwartz's argument wins no support in the references he quotes from Diodorus. For instance, he discovers that the debate before the battle of Salamis, at which the decision was made not to retreat behind the Isthmus, is duplicated in the brief statement that the Greeks, afraid

¹ The passages in order are:

XI. 36, 3-4	and XI. 15, 2-3.	See also XI. 5, 4-5 and XIV. 25.
XIII. 46, 4	„ XIII. 102, 2.	XI. 28 „ XV. 7.
XI. 6, 4	„ XI. 57.	XI. 43 „ XI. 39.
XI. 10	„ XI. 61.	

In any case Ephorus was not the first to repeat earlier passages; Isocrates began the practice (*σ. Περί Ἀντιδόσεως*).

of the Persian forces at Mycale, debated whether to fight or escape in their ships: the storm which stopped the rescue operations at Arginusae has its counterpart in another which closed the engagement off Abydos in 411: and there is a repetition of motive, as in the case of Mandane, who demanded the punishment of Themistocles, and the Persians who attacked Leonidas, all of whom were actuated by the desire to avenge their dead kinsfolk. Only on one occasion is there a slight resemblance of language, and that is in the parallel passages describing the Spartan night attack at Thermopylae and Cimon's similar feat at the Eurymedon. The words, however, which occur are common to most of Ephorus' battles, and it will be seen shortly that in such descriptions he tended to use a number of stock phrases. It is only in this last instance that Schwartz's generalisation can be accepted; and in the opinion of the present writer the three previous references do not form a valid basis for his argument without undue exaggeration of their similarity. At the same time, these are the most likely of his quotations. It cannot be maintained that the use of "topics" was not to be found at all in Ephorus' work, for they were an integral part of his rhetorical training. But as far as the evidence of Diodorus goes, we are not justified in assuming that he invented or adopted this system of duplication. The battle-narratives are clearly his one exception, but there the parallelism may have been due to rather a different cause.

According to Polybius (T. 20) Ephorus had no skill as a military historian, although he had some idea of naval tactics. He cites as proof of his incapacity the

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

descriptions of Leuctra and Mantinea, the latter of which makes special demands on the writer's technical ability. Admittedly, Polybius is stating a case to support his own argument for the need of personal experience; but his remarks are only too true in their application to Ephorus, who appears to have atoned for his incapacity merely by indulgence in a set form of composition. His descriptions of naval battles, in spite of Polybius, do not betray any greater accuracy or understanding, if we may judge from the engagements at Salamis, Arginusae or Cyzicus; it is a pity that the two examples quoted by Polybius are too briefly recorded by Diodorus to enable us to pass an opinion on their merit.¹ However, a consideration of the more detailed passages will show some of Ephorus' deficiencies.

The story of the night attack, perhaps not an invention of Ephorus, was a device frequently inserted in his narrative. Thus the Spartans at Thermopylae, after discovering that they were surrounded, went through the incongruous procedure of taking breakfast, and then making a despairing night attack on the Persian camp. Cimon's exploit at the Eurymedon is too well known to need further mention; but it is surprising to find that the first Persian cavalry attack at Plataea, which has a vague correspondence with Herodotus' account of Masistius' attempt to dislodge the Greeks from their position on the foothills, also took place under cover of darkness. Of a similar nature was the struggle between the Athenians and Thessalians at Tanagra. Ephorus evi-

¹ Diod. xiv. 83, 5-7 (Cnidos) and xv. 3, 4-6 (Cition: Evagoras against the Persians).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

dently appreciated the dramatic value of this improvement on the orthodox reports.¹

Secondly, he had no conception of the necessity of getting precise information on the tactics employed. The battle of Plataea is an outstanding example. Here he fails to explain the various positions of the Greek troops, or the time which elapsed between their arrival on the slopes of Cithaeron and the final engagement. He does remark vaguely that they abandoned their camp on the spurs of the mountain for another place more suitably disposed for a complete victory. In complete contrast to Herodotus' account it would appear that the Greeks deliberately selected this safe position, which was naturally fortified, because its narrowness was advantageous for preventing an attack by the whole Persian army.² Further, it will be noticed that no mention is made of the strange episode of Amompharetus. Finally, the Athenians, who were engaged in a successful struggle with the Boeotians, achieved the impossible feat of pursuing the fugitives to Thebes ten miles away, where a pitched battle took place outside the walls, and returning in time to assist in the Spartan attack on the Persian camp. Clearly Ephorus has combined Herodotus' remark that the Spartan assault was unfruitful until the Athenians returned from their pursuit, with the later episode of Pausanias' march to Thebes to arrest the leaders of the medising party. The fact that Diodorus does not mention a later attack confirms this assumption.

The examination of Diodorus for the battles of Man-

¹ Diod. xi. 10, 1; 61, 2-6; 30, 2 (cf. Herod. ix. 20-23); 80, 3-6.

² Diod. xi. 30, 5-6.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

tinea and Leuctra, or for the sea-fights to which we have previously referred, will show that his authority made no attempt to give an exact account. At Mantinea, for instance, there is no hint that Epaminondas held his centre and right wing back, or that he changed direction immediately before attacking the enemy; and the tactics at Salamis and Cyzicus are unworthy of notice.¹ Instead, we have on each occasion a standardised rhetorical description couched in almost precisely identical terms. The fighting is always stubborn (καρτερὰ μάχη), the issue doubtful (ισόρροπος), the bravery of each side magnificent (εὐρώστως... ἀνδραγαθία), and the result often confusion (ταραχή). It is impossible to read the reports of the more important battles without remarking the frequent occurrence of these words accompanied by the same phraseology. At the same time the narrative is often interrupted by an enthusiastic eulogy. Thus, again at Mantinea, after the Athenians had been routed, Ephorus turns to the description of the contest between the protagonists, Thebes and Sparta, and forgetful of his flattery of Myronides can scarcely find words dignified enough to measure the renown of the combatants or the greatness of his theme. Diodorus' lines are worth quoting in full:

οὐδέποτε γὰρ Ἑλλήνων πρὸς Ἑλληνας ἀγωνιζομένων οὔτε πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν τοσοῦτο παρετάξατο οὔθ' ἡγεμόνες ἀξιολογώτεροι τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν οὔτ' ἀνδρες δυνατώτεροι τὰς ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις ἀνδραγαθίας ἐπεδείξαντο (xv. 86, 1).

¹ Diod. xv. 85-87 (Mantinea); xv. 55-56 (Leuctra); xi. 17-19 (Salamis); xii. 46 (Cyzicus); xiii. 97 (Arginusae).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Enough has been said to depict the main features of this artificial form of composition. It is to Ephorus that the introduction of these adornments of the simple course of history must be ascribed. Plutarch's cynical remark—οὐδεὶς σιδήρου ταῦτα μωραίνει πέλας—suggests an obvious and well-deserved criticism.

We turn now to an equally important problem for our verdict on Ephorus, namely his treatment of mythology. It will be remembered that in the preface to his entire work he laid down the principle that the legends of a remote past were outside his province, because their fundamental truth was not ascertainable—a principle which Diodorus took the trouble to reject on more than one occasion. The corollary of this statement would seem to be a method of diligent inquiry in the search for truth. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that a writer who began to study "the complex and numerous genealogies" should have doubts as to the wisdom of assimilating their contents.¹

However, Ephorus chose to begin his work somewhere in the tenth century with what is now called the Dorian Invasion, but which was known to him by the romantic title of the Return of the Heracleidae. It is strange that Heracles himself should have been relegated to the unknowable past, while the activities of his descendants, not more than three generations later, should be accepted as historically true; strange also, because the dry light of history has never penetrated far into the events of the next two hundred years. Hence the selection of the tenth, instead of the seventh century for a starting-point,

¹ Diod. IV. 1, 4: ἡ ποικιλία καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν γενεαλογουμένων.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

naturally casts doubt upon either the ability or sincerity of the historian; but the fact that he consulted many authorities, and his eagerness to apply rational interpretation to the obscure problems of history and literature leave no suspicion of the honesty of his intentions. The reason for his choice of such a date cannot be known; perhaps the records (ᾠρογραφία) of the Peloponnesian states were fairly consistent in tracing their descent from a Dorian founder. But whatever it may have been, it remains for us now to discover how he applied his axiom to what was still a mythological epoch. In doing so we shall be forced to come to a conclusion between the contradictory statements of Diodorus and Josephus: the former declaring that Ephorus often despised the truth, the latter that he was to be counted amongst the most accurate historians.¹

Diodorus is of no assistance for the discovery of myths in Ephorus' work, partly because some of the essential books are only extant in crude epitomes, and partly because it is uncertain at what point he began to use him as one of his sources.² However, even a cursory investigation of the fragments discloses the fact that Ephorus certainly did not avoid the early legends. The whole system of foundations, as given in F. 18, is evidence of this. It is unfair, however, to attack him on this score, because he merely shared in the common beliefs of his time, and it is only from the modern standpoint that he

¹ *F.G.H.* T. 14 and 16.

² Diodorus may have used Ephorus in the early books. He mentions him in the prefaces to IV and V, and the long account of Lycurgus' constitution was probably derived from him (VII. 12). V. also *F.G.H.* F. 105 n., and Schwartz, P.W. "Diodorus".

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

appears unhistorical. But criticism is perhaps justified when it is apparent that Ephorus did not limit his attention exclusively to the period which began with the tenth century: for example, he referred to the date of Troy's capture (F. 226), and he explained the founding of Amphilochian Argos by Alcmaeon before Agamemnon summoned him to the Trojan War (F. 123).¹ More legendary figures still were the Amazons and the elusive Pelasgians. It is not contended that the names and deeds of Agamemnon or Cadmus do not mask a grain of truth; but rather that Ephorus, who had broken his own rule by upholding the belief in their existence, does not appear to have substantiated his rebuke to the "lovers of myth".

In what sense then did he employ his principle of rational interpretation? The fourth century witnessed the growth of an interest in popular knowledge to which books like the *Περὶ Εὐρημάτων* ministered, and which may even have influenced Ephorus' decision to write a universal history. It was the tentative beginning of that study of past literature which blossomed into scholarship in the Alexandrine period; and as such its conclusions were often the result of superficial judgment and partial investigation. Ephorus himself contributed to this branch of literature; for besides the two books already mentioned, the *Histories* were filled with such scraps of information. Instances have been given of the frequent references to Homer, the collection of inscriptions, and the illustration of proverbs.² Yet another aspect is to

¹ It is worth noting that Thucydides, in spite of his rejection of τὸ μυθώδες, regards such events as historic (v. II. 68, 3).

² *F.G.H.* F. 12, 63, 93.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

be found in the derivations of rare words, or in such explanations as that of Homer's lines on the Cimmerians—

οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς
Ἥλιος φάεθων καταδέρκεται ἄκτινεσσιν
(*Od.* xi. 15),

which turns out to be historically true because they actually did live in caves (F. 134).¹ Again, the story of Io was made to serve a useful philological purpose to explain the origin of the name Bosphorus.² Much more important, however, is the long quotation from Strabo, in which he criticises the rationalisation of the founding of Delphi (F. 31).³ After describing Apollo's civilising influence, Ephorus reached the first stage in the interpretation of the myth by stating the opposing views on the god's bodily or spiritual presence. Unfortunately, the acceptance of the latter view precluded the traditional account of his journey from Athens to Delphi to found his shrine; this Ephorus retained, but tried to effect further rationalisation by transforming the giant Tityus and the serpent Python into fierce and lawless men whom Apollo destroyed. Strabo attacks this half-hearted rationalisation as merely a confusion of history and myth (συγχεῖν ἐβούλετο τὸν τε τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ τὸν τοῦ μύθου τόπον), which does little to justify Ephorus' claim to be speaking the truth. It is difficult for us to tell how far he felt himself at liberty to dissect the traditional

¹ *V.* also *F.G.H.* F. 147.

² *F.G.H.* F. 156. Perhaps also the origin of the name "helot" (F. 117).

³ *V.* also Jacoby's note. Cf. F. 42 (Anacharsis).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

account, or indeed to discover the reason for his discrimination in accepting the stories of Cadmus or the Amazons, and rejecting one such as we have just described. Perhaps he would have defined mythology as legends dealing with the gods, and thereby differentiated between them and the genealogical records. However, in the later portion of his work he shows no trace of scepticism, in fact he goes to the other extreme, as in his unqualified belief in the Persian alliance with the Carthaginians.¹ It seems, after all, that Diodorus was right, and that Ephorus was not too precise in his definition of truth. Busolt sums up the discussion neatly by saying that he left the past alone if it looked at all probable: if not, he rationalised it.²

The last stage of our inquiry is concerned with Ephorus' style. Of modern writers Kalischek has thoroughly investigated the meagre evidence of the fragments, and the few conclusions which he has drawn are sound. It is a pity that he has not considered them in relation to the views of early critics such as Polybius or Dionysius. Diodorus, it is true, is of no assistance; there are passages which afford occasional glimpses of the more rhetorical diction of his authority;³ but they are not enough to allow us to form any definite opinion

¹ He may have rejected Herodotus' miraculous story of the herald's wand at Mycale. Cf. Diod. xi. 35 with Herod. ix. 100. Note also his treatment of Miltiades' Parian expedition in contrast to Herodotus. Cf. F. 63 with Herod. vi. 134. See *J.H.S.* xxxix. pp. 48-61.

² *Griech. Gesch.* i. p. 157: "Wo dieser Schein (des Geschichtlichen) fehlte, da suchte er die Unwahrscheinlichkeit mit plattem Rationalismus zu beseitigen."

³ *V.* p. 81.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

on Ephorus. Otherwise, his own style, the mirror of his ability as a compiler, is dull and formless.

It is to be expected that Ephorus, as a student of the Isocratean school, should exhibit some of its leading features, and although he defended the historian's labours as more arduous than those of the rhetorician, he undoubtedly availed himself of the latter's technique; of this the close resemblances between Diodorus and Isocrates in conjunction with the standardised battle-descriptions give adequate proof. But they bear little similarity to the characterisation of the true Isocratic style. The careful periodic structure with its developed harmonies of antithesis and chiasmus, the effective and balanced placing of word and phrase, which still retains in spite of its thoughtful construction a lifelike expression and content, was not to be found in Ephorus' work. The dictum that a style is discovered, not taught, holds good at all times; the restrained precision of the master becomes artificial exaggeration in the pupil. There was the well-known story (perhaps of later invention) that Isocrates, comparing the abilities of Ephorus and Theopompus, remarked that the latter needed the rein, the former the spur;¹ and the testimony of ancient criticism is almost unanimous in endorsing his opinion. Ephorus' style is described as careless, sluggish, or inactive, the appropriate counterpart of his large production.² Polybius alone raises his voice on the other side. His words, which

¹ Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 204: "Isocratem in acerrimo ingenio Theopompi et lenissimo Ephori traditum est, alteri se calcaria adhibere, alteri frenos." *V. F.G.H.* T. 28.

² *F.G.H.* T. 28: ὑπτιος καὶ νωθρὸς καὶ μηδεμίαν ἔχων ἐπίτασιν. *V.* also T. 23, 25.

are quoted below, show that, far from having any fault to find, he was particularly attracted by the digressions and Ephorus' own personal comments.¹ We must consider the evidence of the text to decide between these opposing views.

Kalischek's analysis makes it unnecessary to embark upon the discussion of the many detailed points with which he has dealt so fully; it is sufficient to note that most of his conclusions have the support of Busolt and Blass.² The marked avoidance of hiatus, except occasionally between the article and the noun, the customary figures of speech, unusual expressions including many ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, and the use of synonyms, were all parts of Ephorus' style. Cicero witnesses to his cultivation of prose-rhythm in his statement that he preferred paeons and dactyls to trochees and spondees;³ a fact which, in combination with his dislike of hiatus, will account for cases of extraordinary word-order.⁴ A passage (F. 71) quoted from the eighteenth book discloses a simple, smooth-flowing style—monotonous in large quantities—which makes no pretence to an elaborate structure. Incidentally, these few lines contain no less than three pairs of synonyms. There is also parallelism of phrase

¹ Polyb. XII. 28, 10 (T. 23): ὁ γὰρ Ἐφορος παρ' ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν θαυμάσιος ὢν καὶ κατὰ τὴν φράσιν καὶ κατὰ τὸν χειρισμὸν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τῶν ληϊμάτων, δεινότατός ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς παρεκβάσεσι καὶ ταῖς ἀφ' αὐτοῦ γνωμολογίαις, καὶ συλλήβδην ἔστιν οὗ τὸν ἐπιμετροῦντα λόγον διατίθηται.

² Kalischek, *De Ephoro et Theopompo Isocratis Discipulis*, pp. 64-76. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, II. pp. 405-408. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* I. pp. 155 sq.

³ Cic. *Orat.* 191.

⁴ F.G.H. F. 47: μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἄσσον ἐστὶ τὰ Γάργαρα πλῆσιον πόλεις. V. F. 39.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

and clause, of which we are fortunate enough to have an example from the first preface, which was doubtless one of the more highly finished parts of his work.¹ The sentences are more simply constructed than Isocrates', but their effect is more artificial. Thus it is that Dionysius mentions Ephorus among the less successful imitators of the typical Isocratean style (T. 24: ποιητικὴν κατασκευήν... μετέωρον... πομπικόν).

The digressions which Polybius so much admired are yet another aspect of the historian's art in the opportunities they afforded for displays of literary skill. Their presence in the geographical books proves that Ephorus was as much concerned here as elsewhere with the embellishment of his work. Thus the stories of Anacharsis, Apollo at Delphi, and Minos and Rhadamanthus found their place in books iv and v. The suitability of the subject-system for such treatment is well illustrated by the reference to Cimon's payment of Miltiades' fine in xi. On the assumption that this book contained the history of the Pentecontaetia, it is evident that this mention of an event belonging to the period of the Persian Wars must have occurred in a biographical excerpt on Cimon's career, perhaps on his first appearance.² At the same

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 9: περί μὲν γὰρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς γεγενημένων τοὺς ἀκριβέστατα λέγοντας πιστοτάτους ἡγούμεθα, περί δὲ τῶν παλαιῶν τοὺς οὕτω διεξιόντας ἀπιθανωτάτους εἶναι νομίζομεν, ὑπολαμβάνοντες οὕτε τὰς πράξεις ἀπάσας οὕτε τῶν λόγων τοὺς πλείστους εἰκὸς εἶναι μνημονεύεσθαι διὰ τοσούτων. In spite of the parallelism the sentence is not well balanced.

² He first appears in 470 (Diod. xi. 60), when he captures Eion and Scyros. There is no hint of his driving Pausanias from Byzantium in 476. Are these mistakes of Diodorus due to Ephorus' digression? Cf. *Oxy. Pap.* 1610 (G. and H. xiii. p. 100), which shows that Ephorus almost certainly digressed on the Theseus story in connection with Cimon's recovery of his bones from Scyros.

time the weakness of a disconnected chronology is apparent. It was therefore a mistake on Diodorus' part when rearranging his material to insert digressions, such as that on Messenia, into his narrative.¹

It is not therefore difficult to decide between Polybius and his opponents. The criticism of Photius is still valid—that Ephorus was more concerned with quantity than quality, with the outpouring of facts and ideas rather than with their selection and arrangement in a pleasant manner (T. 22). Not the feeling for an agreeable style, but the desire for rhetorical brilliance—the cult of the λόγος ἐπιδεικτικός—ran throughout his work. The encomia, prefaces and speeches rose like peaks above the plain of a dull and uninspiring narrative, but were of little avail to stimulate the reader's enthusiasm. It was the work, in fact, of that type of character which Polybius himself described as interested in origins and foundations: the curious, antiquarian temperament (περιττὸν . . . πολυπράγμονα), which failed too often to see the wood for the trees. The application of Isocrates' "spurs" was not intended to stimulate Ephorus' production, but to rouse his critical interest in what he actually wrote. At the same time it must be remembered that the *Histories* proved acceptable to their readers: a fact which Polybius recognised when he admitted that his own record of "actions" would not have a universal appeal. They became a standard work which continued in use

¹ But he did not do so in the case of Ephorus' excursus on the Nile in the account of the Athenian Expedition. This subject had been dealt with in 1. 37—to Ephorus' discomfort (F. 65 n.). Other digressions on Helice and Buri, and Messenia (both from Callisthenes) have already been mentioned.

SOME CRITICISMS OF EPHORUS

until at least the end of the Augustan period. To sum up, we may say that as a model of literary ability they incurred the just displeasure of competent critics; but for Polybius these defects were overshadowed by his admiration for Ephorus as the "first universal historian".

CONCLUSION

THE foregoing chapters complete our investigation of the Histories, and we are left to assess their permanent value not only as records of past events, but also as an example of a particular phase of Greek historical writing. In doing so it will be necessary to steer our way amongst the various opinions of distinguished critics, whose conclusions, based on the undisputed defects of Ephorus' work, have often failed to discover some of its features which deserve more recognition. For the doctrine of "historical relativity" applies to all persons and at all times. The critic of a generation ago, obsessed with the primary duties of the historian—the collection and impartial sifting of all available material—was hindered by his own virtues from attaining a true perspective. Moreover, the evidence at that time had not received the careful treatment and distribution since accorded to it: consequently the foundations for criticism were inadequate and the resulting superstructure was not complete in all its details. Now, however, the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction; and the interpretation and presentation of facts—"the mere dross of history"—is considered of equal importance with their collection. Hence a more lenient view will be taken of the literary mask assumed by Ephorus and his contemporaries. Without doubt they neglected "the indispensable Mr Dryasdust", as Wilamowitz says; but it should be remembered that his true

CONCLUSION

popularity only began in the nineteenth century.¹ At the same time Ephorus' importance must be estimated in the light of the requirements of modern research. A sympathetic understanding of his environment may condone some of his mistakes; but his contribution to the sum total of human knowledge will be regarded as the ultimate criterion by which his work is to be judged.

Let us, then, briefly consider what Ephorus set out to achieve. To Greek and Roman writers he was known as the first universal historian. Not content with episodal history (ἡ κατὰ μέρος ἱστορία) he felt the necessity of repeating on a more grandiose scale the experiment begun by Herodotus. He wished to create a synthesis of world-events; but his interest in the barbarians was confined to their relations with the Greek-speaking peoples. His starting-point, the tenth century, was a self-imposed limitation in the interests of truth. "Pas de documents, pas d'histoire" is a false proposition, but it is one with which Ephorus would certainly have agreed; and even then he found it necessary to apply a rationalistic interpretation occasionally. His intention was to promote virtue and discourage vice; but his moral maxims were really only for the edification of statesmen. Like most Greeks of his time he had no conception of progress in society, and he was not concerned with the improvement of the ordinary individual. His eulogies, therefore, of Aristides' justice or Themistocles' patriotism have about them the hollow ring of the pamphleteer;² and his

¹ *Greek Historical Writing*, p. 25.

² Such interest in individuals does not imply any conception of biographical history as, for example, in Xenophon or later writers.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

whole work was coloured with the glamour of rhetoric. Lastly, he gave up the customary annalistic form for a subject-arrangement, which was employed topographically in the early books, and more or less chronologically in the later.

The credibility of Ephorus' narrative depends to a great extent on his choice and use of the works of his predecessors. To sum up the results of a previous discussion, it is evident that he was not satisfied with a single account for a given period, but that he appears on occasions to have enlarged, or altered, the information of his chief authority by the adoption of at least one secondary and minor source. His use, if not of Thucydides, at least of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* bears witness to his competent selection, and some credit should be given him for preserving a tradition which seems to have been more accurate than Xenophon's. On the other hand the value of such authorities was more than counterbalanced by his frequent acceptance of far less trustworthy versions. Thus he showed no capacity for discrimination, and his superficial judgment easily led him to credit the canards of popular politics, and to transfer into earlier periods beliefs and ideas of his own time. He was in any case out of sympathy with his characters, and was unable to discern the correct motivation of their actions. It is untrue to say that he made no attempt to verify his information: but it is true that he often preferred contemporary anecdotes to the reports of credible historians.

Yet, allowing for all Ephorus' faults, some of which may have been exaggerated by Diodorus' abridgment,

CONCLUSION

it cannot be denied that later writers had frequent recourse to him and did not hesitate to accept his authority. Schwartz's contention that he was quickly thrust on one side by his more illustrious contemporary Theopompus is not justified by modern investigation.¹ The Histories were considered worthy of continuation soon after his death by Diyllus and were carried still further by the Plataean historian Psaon.² Although he was of little value to Polybius as a source, there is no doubt of the latter's close acquaintance with his work. The extensive use made by Diodorus and Strabo three centuries later is beyond dispute. Pompeius Trogus, who wrote the first universal history in the Latin language, seems to have excerpted Ephorus for some of the events of the Pentecontaetia.³ In dealing with the problem of the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia it was observed that Polyaeus upheld parts of the P-Ephorus tradition at the expense of Xenophon; and a study of the passages referred to in Melber's article leaves no doubt that Polyaeus had direct access to Ephorus' work.⁴ This is the most likely explanation of the minor deviations from Diodorus in places where their narratives are otherwise

¹ Schwartz, P.W. "Eph." col. 15 sq. Cf. *F.G.H.* II c, pp. 32-35.

² Diod. xvi. 14, 5 and xxi. 5. The story (T. 17) that the poet Alcaeus (c. 200) wrote a parody on Ephorus' "thefts" from other writers shows that the Histories were well known.

³ V. Wolffgarten, *De Ephori et Dinonis Historiis a Trogo Pompeio expressis*, pp. 1-60. There is no doubt that his conclusions go too far. But Jacoby (*F.G.H.* II c, p. 32) is unduly sceptical. Holzapfel (*Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*, ch. vi) has re-examined Wolffgarten's argument and offers a reasonable case for a partial use of Ephorus for the Pentecontaetia.

⁴ "Über d. Quellen u. d. Wert d. Strategemensammlung Polyäns", v. p. 62.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

substantially the same. Moreover, Ephorus' occasional appearance in Plutarch is attested by the fragments, which bear, in fact, abundant witness to the popularity of the *Histories* in the first two centuries A.D. The value of the geographical books was recognised as late as 500 A.D. by Stephanus of Byzantium, although it is uncertain whether he was using an intermediate source. Reference was made to Ephorus' work by lexicographers and literary critics, and appropriate portions were selected by later writers for collections of Paradoxes and famous stories. It was for this reason, perhaps, that Suidas incorporated in his notice the titles of books which Ephorus did not write.¹ We have here more than sufficient evidence to refute Schwartz's decision. What is its significance for our final verdict on Ephorus?

The *Histories* were read, not so much because their style and contents may have pleased the uncritical reader, but because of the prestige Ephorus gained by setting the fashion for universal history. This was the reason for the admiration of Polybius and Diodorus, both of whom qualified their respect by acknowledging that he did not always record the truth. This new type of history was acclaimed as a compendium of learning, if not of critical ability. Moreover it was intensely subjective, and subjectivity is often wont to stimulate interest without evoking doubt. If Ephorus is to be judged entirely by his contribution to the world's stock of accurate knowledge, his work is not of great value; for the critic has more often to explain away its difficulties than to appraise its merits: nor does Ephorus stand the test of a com-

¹ *V.* p. 6.

CONCLUSION

parison with Thucydides. On the other hand, with the exception of Xenophon, he was the most important historian of the fourth century; and the study of his work is useful, not only for the light it throws on Diodorus and the credibility of his narrative, but also for the investigation of the principal features of a new phase of Greek historiography. Admittedly, its defects outweighed its virtues. But if Ephorus is criticised as the first to attempt the fusion of rhetoric and history, he was certainly not the last or worst offender. The chroniclers of Alexander's exploits were far less scrupulous in their regard for truth; and a still lower level was reached by Duris of Samos in the theory that history must affect the emotions. It was left for Polybius two centuries later to effect the redemption of Clio from the bondage of fiction.

APPENDIX I

THE SICILIAN NARRATIVE OF DIODORUS XI-XVI

As Diodorus' authorities for events in Sicily during the period 480-337 there are two historians whose claims need to be considered, Ephorus and Timaeus. There is no evidence from Diodorus' text or from other writers to support the use of the Syracusan historian, Antiochus; and it will be shown later in the case of Philistus that Ephorus and Timaeus were intermediaries between him and Diodorus. The consideration of Ephorus is complicated by the fact that very little is known of the contents of his Sicilian narrative; while many of the extant fragments which refer to Timaeus deal with topics which Diodorus has not seen fit to incorporate in his work, or are criticisms of his style and methods by writers such as Polybius, which, although they afford some clues to the analysis of Diodorus' narrative, are not specially valuable for identifying Timaeus as his authority. The ground was first surveyed by Volquardsen, most of whose conclusions have been confirmed by Schwartz's article on Diodorus in Pauly's encyclopaedia; and the reader is referred to both of these authorities for a full account of the evidence. In the following summary of the results of their investigations the evidence is only quoted on the occasions when the present writer's conclusions differ from theirs.

With the exception of XII. 12-21, it has been established that Timaeus was Diodorus' authority for the period 480-434; but it is worth considering whether Diodorus compiled some of the events of this period from two sources, Ephorus

APPENDICES

and Timaeus. Let us first examine the campaign of Himera (XI. 20-27).

It is known that Ephorus regarded the simultaneous attacks of Persia and Carthage as part of a premeditated scheme.¹ Diodorus mentions this in the opening chapter of XI where he is obviously working from Ephorus and refers to it again in ch. 20, when he begins to describe the Carthaginian invasion of Sicily, after bringing his narrative of the Persian Wars down to the battle of Salamis. Further, the numbers of the Carthaginian forces are given in XI. 1, 5 and 20, 2 as 300,000 infantry and 200 warships, figures which savour of the round numbers assigned by Ephorus to the Persian army (see Appendix X). It is significant that Diodorus quotes the same figures from Ephorus for the Carthaginians on two other occasions with the addition of Timaeus' lower estimate.² Timaeus in no passage assesses their numbers at the obviously exaggerated figure of 300,000 men.

While, therefore, it is beyond dispute that the bulk of Diodorus' narrative came from Timaeus, it does seem possible that it is coloured by a study of Ephorus. In fact, Diodorus probably adopted the latter's theory of a concerted attack on the Greek world, and read it into his interpretation of his second and major authority. Admittedly Timaeus, whom we know to have read Ephorus, may have incorporated it himself, but then we should have expected him to correct Ephorus' numbers in accordance with his usual practice.

A use of Ephorus is, perhaps, also to be seen in two passages (XI. 23, 3 and 48, 4) which suggest that Diodorus did not altogether succeed in harmonising two divergent accounts. In the first, which occurs somewhat irrelevantly

¹ *F.G.H.* F. 186.

² XIII. 80, 5 and XIV. 54, 5. Herodotus gives the same numbers (VII. 165); but a comparison of Diodorus with Herodotus shows that the former's source was quite independent of the latter.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

in the middle of the story of Himera, Diodorus mentions that Gelon lived to a good old age in the enjoyment of his tyranny; whereas, in ch. 38, two years later, his death is recorded. Secondly, there are several important discrepancies between Diodorus' story of Hieros' treatment of Polyzelus and the version attributed to Timaeus (*v. Tim. F.H.G.* frg. 90). The disagreement as to whether Polyzelus was to be sent to fight for or against Sybaris may be due to an error of the scholiast;¹ but to take only one point, we cannot reconcile his successful termination of the war with Diodorus' statement that Polyzelus refused to go and fled to Acragas. Volquardsen disregards these difficulties, while Lenschau contends that Timaeus gave the two parallel accounts and was unable to decide which was the more accurate; if Lenschau was right we might expect to find both accounts given in the scholium.² A simpler explanation lies in the hypothesis that Diodorus was using a second authority; and from the previous considerations it would appear that that authority was very probably Ephorus.

The description of the laws of Charondas and Zaleucus (xii. 12-21) affords an instance of Diodorus writing from yet another source. Timaeus denied the existence of Zaleucus (*F.H.G.* frg. 69): Ephorus regarded him as the earliest lawgiver with a written code (*F.G.H.* F. 139). Diodorus' source grouped the two lawgivers together, but this combination would hardly be made by Ephorus. Neither historian, therefore, can be held responsible for Diodorus' account under the date 446. Moreover, the pseudo-ethical

¹ The fact that Sybaris did not exist, at least as an important town, at this time does not help. Timaeus may have referred to survivors living at Laus and Scidrus (*v. C.A.H.* v. p. 146) or to a commercially unimportant town dependent on Croton (*v. Kahrstedt*, "Zur Geschichte Grossgriechenlands im 5. Jahrhundert", *Hermes*, LIII. p. 183).

² *V. Volquardsen, Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor*, p. 90, and P.W. "Hiero", col. 1497.

APPENDICES

moralising tendencies of both passages suggest a writer interested in the legislative theories of the Hellenistic period. Against the shadowy claims of Poseidonius Professor Adcock's argument for the use of Hermippus' *Περὶ Νομοθετῶν* carries conviction.¹

We come now to the Athenian expeditions to Sicily (XII. 53–XIII. 33). A comparison of Diodorus with Thucydides, apart from the former's very much shortened version, reveals a striking similarity between the two accounts, both in their general structure and details. There are minor deviations; for example, Thucydides puts Lamachus' death before the arrival of Gylippus, Diodorus after; and numbers of ships and men do not always agree; but it is impossible to resist the conclusion that Thucydides' account, through whatever intermediary, is the basis of Diodorus' narrative.

It is noteworthy that Diodorus (XII. 53–54) puts all the events of the expedition of 427 under one year, an indication that his source was probably not arranged on a careful chronological system. As is shown elsewhere in the text, this savours of the subject-arrangement characteristic of Ephorus.² Secondly, there is an allusion to the 10,000 talents mentioned in the passage introductory to the Archidamian War. This has been ascribed to Ephorus.³ Thirdly, Diodorus omits entirely the conference of Gela and the part played therein by Hermocrates. This is at least a possible argument against Timaeus, who is known to have regarded Hermocrates as almost the predestined saviour of Syracuse, and who surely did not lose this opportunity to introduce him to his readers.⁴ Timaeus' belief in the punishment of

¹ *Camb. Hist. Journal*, II. 1927: "2. Literary tradition and early Greek code-makers."

² *V.* ch. II.

³ *V.* ch. VII. But the Gorgias story was surely proverbial. We cannot, therefore, assume a use of Timaeus from the parallel passage in Dio. Hal. *de Lysia*, ch. 3.

⁴ Cf. Polyb. XII. 25, κ.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

impiety is clearly evident in other parts of Diodorus' narrative;¹ but it is singularly absent in the latter's account of the Athenian attack on Syracuse. Diodorus records the mutilation of the *Hermæ*, the recall of Alcibiades and the failure of the expedition without any hint of a superstitious connection between the first and subsequent events. Similarly, while Timæus presumably emphasised the part played by Hermocrates, the references to him in Diodorus are few and meagre. He is barely mentioned as one of the elected Syracusan generals; he reappears at the end of the campaign with his suggestion to block the roads; he advises lenient treatment for the prisoners, but does not seem to have taken any noteworthy part in the debate which followed Diocles' proposal. Those brief references are reminiscent of the treatment accorded to Hermocrates by Thucydides, who, while recognising his skill and courage (vi. 72, 2), refers but briefly in some eight or nine passages to his share in the deliverance of Syracuse.²

There is, however, a further argument from the closing chapters of the Athenian expedition which appear to offer more definite evidence against the use of Timæus than has hitherto been accepted. In the summaries which follow of Diodorus, Thucydides and Plutarch, it is highly probable that the whole of Plutarch's description came from Timæus. In his short account he cites Timæus twice by name, and his narrative does not appear, as it sometimes does, to be a patchwork of two or more authorities.

Diodorus XIII. 19-33:

Diocles proposed the execution of the generals.
Hermocrates advised leniency.

¹ V. XIII. 86, 1; XIV. 63, 1-2; 76, 3-4.

² It is, perhaps, significant that the Campanian mercenaries who played a prominent part in Timæus' work (v. Diod. XIII, XIV), and who were said by him to have been sent to help the Athenians against Syracuse, are not mentioned in Diodorus' account of the expedition.

APPENDICES

Nicolaus supported Hermocrates. } Speeches given
Gylippus urged their execution. } by Diodorus.

The proposal carried: Nicias and Demosthenes executed.

Plutarch, *Nicias*, xxviii:

Eurycles proposed the execution of the generals.

Hermocrates advised lenient treatment.

Gylippus wished to take them back to Sparta, but was refused.

Hermocrates urged them to kill themselves while the debate was still in progress. This they did and avoided public execution.

Thucydides vii. 86:

Nicias and Demosthenes were executed against the wish of Gylippus, who wanted to carry them to Sparta.

The agreement between Diodorus and Thucydides goes no further than the statement that the generals were put to death. The speeches in Diodorus must have come from some other source. It is also evident that Diodorus differed from Plutarch in everything except the statement that Hermocrates pleaded against the death penalty. The most important feature which emerges from the comparison of the three accounts is that the rôle assigned to Gylippus in the Thucydides-Timaeus-Plutarch tradition is exactly the opposite of that given by Diodorus. Diodorus' source, therefore, may have been Ephorus or Philistus.

To sum up we may say that Diodorus' account of the expedition against Syracuse, in so far as it is close to Thucydides in its essential structure and details, while it adds in less important ways to the latter's account, appears to spring from a writer who followed Thucydides for the framework of his narrative, but who had access to local information and perhaps relied in some measure on the

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

evidence of eyewitnesses (*v.* ch. 14, 2 and 4). This writer, however, was not Timaeus, who, to judge from Plutarch's criticism (*Nic.* 1), probably differed from Thucydides to a greater extent and in more important details than appears from Diodorus.

In searching for this source we think first of the Sicilian historian, Philistus, who claimed to have seen the events he describes and was an admirer of Thucydides' style and methods.¹ We should expect, therefore, in reading Philistus to find a reproduction of Thucydides with the addition of details from his own experiences.

On the other hand it is improbable that Diodorus had direct access to Philistus' work; for although he frequently quotes Timaeus and Ephorus as his authorities, he only refers once to Philistus apart from the usual biographical notices.² In any case, although Philistus enjoyed a reputation in the time of Diodorus, it does not seem probable that the latter would have troubled to go beyond Timaeus and Ephorus. Further, certain features of Diodorus' account would be better explained by reference to Ephorus.³ We have already remarked on the grouped events of the first expedition. It is at least probable that Philistus as an admirer of Thucydides would have adopted a similar

¹ *V. Plut. Nic.* xix; *Dio. Hal. Ep. ad Pomp.* ch. v, and *Theon. Progymn.* i. p. 154.

² *v.* 6. But this also probably came through Timaeus, cf. *Plut. Dion.* xxxv. 6 with *Diod.* xiv. 85.

³ We may disregard Holzapfel's theory (*op. cit.* ch. iv) that Ephorus was not the source of *Diod.* xiii. 11-17. His argument is that the Athenian numbers in these chapters are larger than the Syracusan although they are being defeated; whereas a partisan of Athens such as Ephorus appears to have been would have made them smaller. Against this it must be said that Ephorus often allots larger numbers to the Athenians both in times of defeat and victory (*v.* *Diod.* xii. 69, 3; xiii. 97, 2-3). In any case if Ephorus was writing with the familiar Isocratean prejudice against a naval empire, he had every reason to exaggerate the extent of Athenian losses in Sicily.

APPENDICES

chronological scheme; and if he had, it is unlikely that Diodorus would have compressed his source to the disregard of its systematic arrangement and in contrast to the chronological system at which he aimed. Whereas if Ephorus, as has been suggested (p. 43), regarded Leontini's appeal to Athens in 427 as the beginning of Athenian interference in Sicily, and recorded in one book (xiv) the whole period of Athenian enterprise in the West, Diodorus' compression receives at once an adequate explanation. Moreover, the close similarity of passages in the speeches with Isocrates' style and thought is noticed elsewhere (v. Chapter v); and the implied condemnation of Athenian imperialism running through Nicolaus' speech together with the reference to the Peace of Callias (xiii. 25, 2) suggest a follower of Isocrates. Yet Ephorus had a high regard for Philistus, whose work he knew (v. Plut. *Dion.* xxxvi). Can we doubt then that the threefold character of Diodorus' narrative—its close resemblance to Thucydides coupled with additional details and the traces of Ephorus—is best explained by Diodorus' use of Ephorus as an intermediary between himself and Philistus?¹

At the end of the Athenian Expedition Diodorus returned to Timaeus. It is unnecessary to give the evidence which has established Timaeus as his authority, or at least his chief authority, for the rest of xiii and xiv.² The point at which he turned away from Ephorus would seem to be in ch. 34. Diodorus had recorded Diocles' work and death in apparent connection with his part in the debate (ch. 33); but in the following year he reopens the subject to give a second account of his laws (ch. 34, 6). Diocles is introduced in much the same words as were used of him when he first

¹ Freeman's hypothesis (*Hist. of Sicily*, III. p. 611) that Diodorus used Thucydides, Ephorus and a Sicilian historian is not warranted by our knowledge of Diodorus' methods.

² V. P.W. "Diodorus". It is not possible to decide whether Diodorus found his quotations from Ephorus in Timaeus or was using Ephorus as a parallel source.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

appeared in ch. 19, 4. If the assumption that Timaeus was Plutarch's source for the whole story of the debate on the Athenian prisoners is correct, where the speaker who proposed to execute Nicias and Demosthenes was not Diocles but Eurycles, Diodorus' reintroduction of Diocles may be ascribed to a use of Timaeus, who was, perhaps, presenting him to his readers for the first time.

The discovery of Diodorus' authority for xv is much more difficult; and it is only with considerable reserve that we can accept Schwartz's theory of a use of Ephorus (*v. P.W.* "Diod." col. 681). Schwartz has pointed out both the discrepancies between the two accounts of Dionysius' embassy to the Olympic games, and the fact that the rest of Diodorus' narrative, which is short in comparison with that of the preceding book and somewhat confused, suggests the use of an author who paid no particular attention to chronology.

It may be admitted that Diodorus turned to a new source, strange as it may seem for him to have forsaken Timaeus in the middle of Dionysius' reign; but the argument for Ephorus cannot be considered as proved in any way. We must neglect the agreement of Ephorus and Diodorus over Pharos on the ground that any competent historian would have recorded it in his account of Dionysius' schemes in the Adriatic.¹ In the different accounts of the results of Dionysius' failure at Olympia, if we accept Timaeus for the first, there is little reason for assuming Ephorus for the second;² for, while Diodorus differs from Plutarch as to the cause of Philistus' banishment, Plutarch's account based on Philistus is more likely to be correct; and Philistus was almost certainly Ephorus' chief authority.³ Moreover, the increasing con-

¹ Cf. *F.G.H.* F. 89 with xv. 13, 4.

² *xiv.* 109 and *xv.* 7.

³ This does not support Niese's suggestion (*P.W.* "Dionysius I", col. 903) that Timaeus used Philistus and Diodorus Timaeus. There is no evidence for this theory.

APPENDICES

fusion of Diodorus xv and xvi in Greek and Sicilian events is no evidence either for or against Ephorus. Diodorus, therefore, may still have followed Timaeus, who in his turn was using a source other than Philistus, perhaps because the latter's work was too detailed or too favourable to the tyrant for Timaeus' liking, or he may have forsaken Timaeus altogether for the moment; but there is no evidence on behalf of Ephorus.

Book xvi records the expeditions of Dion and Timoleon. We may note that Diodorus agrees largely with Plutarch, but has frequent, and some important, deviations: for example, the story of Philistus' death, the different reasons given for the delay of Heracleides in sailing from the Peloponnese, Dionysius' intention to kill Dion, the whole story of Timoleon and Timophanes, and the different order of events before the battle of the Crimesus. At the same time we may suspect that Diodorus did not use Timaeus alone (cf. xvi. 70, 3 with Polybius xii a), although the flattering reference to Timaeus' father, Andromachus (ch. 7, 1), the portents which accompanied Timoleon's voyage, and his speech before the Crimesus (cf. ch. 79, 2 with Polybius xii. 26) must have come from Timaeus.

In seeking for Diodorus' secondary source, the argument for Ephorus must be rejected which is based on the theory that his Sicilian narrative stopped in 356 and that this explains the abrupt interruption of Diodorus' account of Dion in that year;¹ nor can any satisfactory argument be based on the slight agreement of Diodorus and Ephorus as to the self-inflicted death of Philistus.²

The story of the Crimesus campaign contains a reference to the Sacred War, and it is possible that Diodorus' deviations from Timaeus come from his acquaintance with a

¹ Ephorus dealt with Timoleon (*F.G.H.* F. 221). See also Laqueur, *Hermes*, xlvi. p. 335.

² Cf. xvi. 16, 3 with Plut. *Dion.* xxxv.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

writer who dealt with the Sacred War and this period of Sicilian history. For the former neither Ephorus nor Demophilus was his authority, but it is probable that Diyllus was (see Appendix V). When, therefore, we find that this historian was concerned with Sicily as well for the period 357-297 and that Diodorus presumably had read his work, it is at least a possible assumption that here we have Diodorus' secondary source. Doubtless Diyllus knew Ephorus' history, but whether points of divergence from Timaeus are to be traced back ultimately to him we cannot say. This hypothesis seems at least somewhat more attractive than the vague suggestion that Diodorus used an historian who lived after Timaeus and had conflated his account with those of other authorities (P.W. "Diodorus", col. 687).

APPENDIX II

EPHORUS' SYSTEM OF RECKONING

The exact length of the period dealt with in the *Histories* depends on the interpretation of two passages: Diodorus xvi. 76, 5 states that up to the siege of Perinthus (341) Ephorus had covered 750 years: whereas Clement of Alexandria (*F.G.H.* F. 223) says that he brought his work down through a period of 735 years to 334, the time of Alexander's crossing into Asia. The date of the Return of the Heracleidae is thus 1090 or 1069. Since most authorities agree in dating the Dorian Invasion 1100-1000, the figures of both writers appear to be fairly correct, although Clement's statement, which is naturally suspect as occurring in a list of historians who all seem to have chosen the same starting-point, is certainly wrong in implying that Ephorus' work ended in 334. It should be noted that Jacoby seeks to bring them into line exactly by emending the numeral sign $\bar{\text{N}}$ in the above chapter of Diodorus to $\bar{\Lambda}$ (F. 223 n.).

Ephorus' system of reckoning was not by Olympiads, but, as Jacoby says, by "generations and synchronisms" (F. 62 n.). Thus Lycurgus is said to be five generations later than Althamenes (F. 149), and in another place ἐνδέκατος ἂν Ἡρόκλεους (F. 173); again, Homer lived many generations after the Heracleidae's return (F. 102). The evidence of the last fragment, combined with F. 149, 19, provides the best example we have of synchronisation. Lycurgus is said to have met Homer in Chios, and (if Scaliger's emendation of Euforbus to Ephorus is accepted in F. 102) their dates are the same.

For Ephorus the hegemony of Sparta began with the institution of Lycurgus' reforms, and ended with the disaster

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

of Leuctra. When therefore we find in the preface to Diodorus xv the statement that the battle of Leuctra saw the end of the Spartan supremacy which had lasted for five hundred years, we are at liberty to fix the date of Lycurgus as 870.¹ This may be reached by another calculation, which shows incidentally that Ephorus probably regarded a generation as a period of thirty years. We know that Lycurgus was "eleventh from Heracles"; the traditional date of the latter was c. 1200; and eleven generations produce the year 870.

Such a method of dating as this is quite beyond criticism, and if, as Schwartz says (P.W. "Eph." col. 6), the most important part of Ephorus' work was the history of his own times, it is difficult to imagine how the later books of the Histories were ever intelligible. Unfortunately, while it is impossible to discover whether he applied the reckoning by generations only to the "genealogical" period, and adopted afterwards a more or less annalistic system (limited, of course, by his *κατὰ γένος* arrangement), the conviction is equally impossible that a reader of Thucydides and a close copyist of the well-dated *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* could overlook their obvious superiority. It would be necessary, nevertheless, to overstep the bounds of impartial criticism to give Ephorus the benefit of the doubt. Indeed our suspicions of his inadequacy are perhaps justified when we discover the difficulties and the mistakes which beset Diodorus when he combined Ephorus' narrative with his chronological source.

¹ From this it would seem that the numeral sign in Diodorus vii. 12 is false. In speaking of Lycurgus' constitution he says of the Spartans *τὴν δὲ ἡγεμονίαν διεκράδαν ἐπὶ ἑτῇ πλείω τῶν υ'*.

APPENDIX III

THE BOOKS OF THE HISTORIES

Early Greece:

- I. Dorian settlements in the Peloponnese.
- II. Central, West and North Greece.
- III. Athens, Euboea and Ionia.

World Geography:

- IV. Europe.
- V. Asia—Africa.
- VI. Sparta. Eighth—seventh centuries.
- VII. Sicily: Greek colonisation in the western Mediterranean.

The East:

- VIII. Rise of Persia—Ionian Revolt?.
- IX. " " " "
- X. Persian Wars.
- XI. Pentecontaetia.
- XII. Sicily. 500?—440.

The Peloponnesian War:

- XIII. Archidamian War.
- XIV. Athenian Expedition to Sicily, including Leontini's appeal in 427.
- XV. Deceleian War.
- XVI. Sicily. 409—392.
- XVII. The Anabasis.
- XVIII. Thibron, Dercyllidas and Agesilaus in Asia Minor. 399—395.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

- XIX. Corinthian War—King's Peace. 395–386.
- XX. Spartan seizure of Mantinea—alliance of Athens and Thebes. 385–378.
- XXI. Agesilaus' invasion of Boeotia—Peace of Callias. 378–371.
- XXII. Leuctra: Epaminondas' first Peloponnesian campaign. 371–370.
- XXIII. Epaminondas' second Peloponnesian campaign. 369–367.
- XXIV. Epaminondas' third Peloponnesian campaign. 367–365.
- XXV. Destruction of Orchomenos—battle of Mantinea. 364–362.
- XXVI. Egypt and Persia.
- XXVII. Accession of Philip—siege of Perinthus. 359–341.
- XXVIII. Sicily. 392–367.
- XXIX. Sicily. 367–344?.
- XXX. The Sacred War. (Demophilus.)

APPENDIX IV

THE GEOGRAPHY OF EPHORUS

The rather thankless task of reconstructing Ephorus' geography has been undertaken by E. Dopp ("Die geographischen Studien d. Ephoros, I and II", *Progr. Rostock*, 1900 and 1908), whose work consists of quotations from the long iambic poem—Περὶ ἡγῆσις—attributed mistakenly to Scymnus (c. 80 B.C.), and from Strabo. He concludes from the similarity between these writers and their agreement with some of the fragments of Ephorus that Scymnus made extensive use of the two geographical books,¹ and that Strabo did so on occasions. In addition, the fifth-century (A.D.) geographer, Stephanus of Byzantium, frequently quoted from this part of the Histories. Dopp's work, which only amounts to a catalogue of references to place-names, is merely valuable for its indication of the wide scope of Ephorus' knowledge.

However, Jacoby (*F.G.H.* F. 35-37 n. and 128-172 n.) has discovered a number of points of difference between Scymnus and Ephorus which Dopp had apparently overlooked; and he inclines to the belief that Scymnus knew of his work through an intermediary.² The following may be cited as examples of the tiny deviations which lead him to this conclusion: the region which Ephorus described as ἡ Κελτική reached for him as far as Gades; in Scymnus only to Tartessus: again, the former gives thirteen as the number of the barbarian tribes living west of the Issos-Sinope line, whereas Scymnus records twelve (see also F. 151 and 154 n.). These disagreements are slight, it is true; but if Scymnus

¹ He also quoted from I-III; cf. F. 18.

² *F.G.H.* II c, pp. 34-35.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

was using Ephorus direct there is no need for them to be there.

A way out of the difficulty is suggested by a consideration of Bruchmann's article ("Beiträge z. Ephoros-Kritik", *Progr. d. K. Wilh. Gymn. Breslau*, 1889), where in a discussion of later users of Ephorus he had already come to much the same conclusions as Dopp was to reach. For instance, he quotes from Scymnus to show how he reflected Ephorus' local patriotism:

μάλιστα τ' εὐανδρουμένη
κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Κύμη ὅστι κειμένη πόλις (I. 293).

But he admits that, since Apollodorus is a probable source of part of Strabo's work, it is a possible assumption that when Scymnus agrees with the latter he is quoting from the same authority.

Thus a possible explanation of the divergences might be found in Scymnus' use of Apollodorus as an intermediary between himself and Ephorus. This view is upheld by U. Hofer (*Rhein. Mus.* LXXXII, p. 67, 1933). He shows that in so far as the intermediary did not use Ephorus alone he may well be Apollodorus who is described as πάντων ἐπιτομὴν τῶν χύδην εἰρημένων (Skymnus 32). It is noticeable that Scymnus appears to have accepted Ephorus for the geography of Greece (F. 144), and that points of difference are mainly confined to places in other parts of the world. Perhaps Apollodorus was responsible for these.

APPENDIX V

THE SACRED WAR

Diod. xvi. 14: Δημόφιλος μὲν δ' Ἐφόρου τοῦ ἱστοριογράφου υἱὸς τὸν παραλειφθέντα πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὀνομασθέντα δὲ ἱερὸν, συντεταγμένος....

Diodorus xvi, as Volquardsen has shown in an interesting passage (*op. cit.* p. 110 sq.), contains two accounts of the Sacred War. The story opens in chs. 23-25; then the first narrative breaks off with a digression on the oracle (ch. 26), and the second, partly a recapitulation of the first but with divergent details and different colouring, begins (chs. 28-40, 56-64). In conjunction with his notice of Demophilus' continuation quoted above, Diodorus states that the Athenian historian Diyllus began his history at the same point. It seems fairly obvious that Diodorus has been working from two authorities, and that he is responsible for the parallel presentation of the two accounts.¹ Demophilus' version filled the thirtieth book, and the fact that Diodorus mentions this before his first account suggests that this was the source of chs. 23-25. The digression on the oracle was the point at which Diodorus turned to another authority who was probably Diyllus.²

In passing, it may be noted that Dr Walker's assumption (*Hell. Oxy.* 94) that Ephorus did not adhere strictly to his κατὰ γένος principle is groundless. He claims Ephorus as

¹ Busolt (*Griech. Gesch.* III. ii. p. 29) claims that Diodorus had only one source and copied it badly. But then, apart from the gross blunder attributed to Diodorus in giving two versions of the same thing, we have to account for the discrepancies.

² For a discussion of this problem and a parallel presentation of the two accounts see Kahrstedt, *op. cit.* bibliography, p. 27 sq.

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

the source of chs. 23–27, and supposes that the second version was composed by Demophilus, who actually carried his narrative down to the siege of Perinthus. Dr Walker thus ignores the fact that Diodorus is careful enough to point out Ephorus' omission of the Sacred War just before his first account of it begins; he also contradicts Diodorus' second statement (xvi. 76, 5), which clearly implies that Ephorus himself, not his son, reached the siege of Perinthus. Dr Walker finds support for his view in an article by Schwartz in *Hermes*, 1909; for the other side of the question, see *Hermes*, 1909 and 1911, where Niese and Laqueur uphold the plain implication of Diodorus' words. These three articles are referred to in the Bibliography.

APPENDIX VI

A COMPARISON OF THE TEXTS OF P AND DIODORUS

1. Below are given the passages in which Diodorus shows the greatest resemblance to P:

Col. II. 7 sq. = XIV. 82. While Diodorus does not mention Timocrates' bribery he accepts in a shorter form P's causes of the war.

Col. III. 23 = XIV. 79, 8. Diodorus gives: παρεγενήθησαν δὲ τῷ Κόνωνι τριήρεις ἐνενήκοντα, δέκα μὲν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας, ὀγδοήκοντα δ' ἀπὸ Φοινίκης, ὧν ὁ Σιδωνίων δυνάστης εἶχε τὴν ἡγεμονίαν.

Accepting Grenfell and Hunt's restoration of the papyrus we have:

κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Φοινίκων
ἦκον ἐνενήκοντα νῆες εἰς Καῦνον ὧν
δέκα μὲν ἔπλευσαν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας αἱ δὲ λείπουσai
ἀπὸ]ᾱς Ἀκτων ὁ Σιδώνιος

It should be noted that Diodorus puts their arrival after the revolt of Rhodes. P assigns this to 395. Diodorus has confused the expulsion of the tyrants (winter 396) with the revolution (summer 395) in which the philo-Athenian democracy was set up.

Cols. V-VII. 4 = XIV. 79-80. The papyrus is very mutilated in col. v, but there is some slight verbal agreement, and the order of events is the same. In VI, which has the most important bearing on our problem, the account of the ambush is very like Diodorus, ch. 80, 2-3; see G. and H. p. 216, where Diodorus is given in full and the verbal

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

resemblances underlined. Dr Walker has put a masterly expression of the case for Ephorus (*op. cit.* p. 49 sq.) on the basis of this fragment, but it must be admitted with G. and H. that "although the general resemblance is very close, the verbal coincidences are not striking, and there is a tactical discrepancy". P's account of Agesilaus' movements after the battle is omitted by Diodorus.

2. In the following passages Diodorus gives a much shorter version than P:

Cols. VII-VIII=XIV. 80, 6-8. Tithraustes' execution of Tissaphernes for his lack of success against Agesilaus.

Col. XI. 1-34=XIV. 79, 6 sq. A careful account of the democratic rising at Rhodes. The papyrus gives the correct date for this: *v. supra*, col. III. 23 and G. and H. pp. 211-213.

Cols. XIV. 6-XV. 32=XIV. 81, 1. The dispute between Locris and Phocis which became the immediate cause of the Corinthian War owing to the diplomacy of Ismenias. Diodorus summarises these details in three lines, and thereby produces the false impression that the Spartans were the aggressors.

3. In some cases Diodorus omits altogether much that is found in P:

Col. XII. 31=XIV. 5. P describes the factions at Thebes and their Spartan and Athenian sympathies. This is important if the Theban use of the Locrian-Phocian dispute is to be properly understood.

Col. XV. 32=XVI. 29. Conon visits Pharnabazus and Tithraustes to get money for the fleet. Diodorus (XIV. 81, 4-6) only records a visit to Artaxerxes for the same purpose. G. and H. p. 234, 1, 37 n. are incorrect in stating that P supports Diodorus' date which they give as the autumn of 395. Ch. 82 opens with the Olympiad-year $96/2 = 395-4$. The latest events of the preceding year 396-5 could not have occurred later than June 395, and Conon's journey is

APPENDICES

assigned to that year. On the other hand G. and H. are correct in saying that he did not see Artaxerxes before the autumn or winter of 395-4. Diodorus was mistaken.

Cols. xvi. 30-xviii. 33. The mutiny of Conon's fleet.

Cols. xviii. 33-xxi. 39. Agesilaus' autumn campaign (395). Although P has great detail Diodorus omits it entirely.

It may be mentioned here that Hieronymus and Nico-
demus (col. xi. 10) were to be found in Ephorus (*F.G.H.*
F. 73). The spelling of Ἀκράφνιον instead of Ἀκράφιον
(xii. 20) was in accordance with Ephorus' usage (*F.G.H.*
F. 229), but was common to other writers. Both these points
are of little value as evidence for Ephorus.

APPENDIX VII

A COMPARISON OF P WITH XENOPHON

The following are the passages in which P gives greater detail than Xenophon, and sometimes corrects him:

Col. I. 33 = *Hell.* III. 5, 1-2. Timocrates was sent by Pharnabazus (397-6), not by Tithraustes (395). Xenophon's belief that the gold was the cause of the war misses the underlying motive of dissatisfaction with Sparta, which P gives. Xenophon also expressly says that the Athenian leaders did not accept the bribes: P following fourth-century tradition is more likely to be right.

Col. III. 11 sq. = *Hell.* III. 4, 1-2 and IV. 3, 10-14. A full account of the naval war which Xenophon only mentions incidentally.

Cols. v. 6-vii. 4 = *Hell.* IV. 20-24 and *Ages.* I. 30-33. P is more detailed. G. and H. (pp. 117 and 217) discuss the many points of difference and suggest that P's narrative is preferable.

Cols. VII. 14-viii. 42 = *Hell.* III. 4, 25. A long account of Tissaphernes' supersession by Tithraustes of which Xenophon has a brief notice.

Cols. XIV. 21-xv. 15 = *Hell.* III. 5, 1-3. P offers more detail than Xenophon about the formation of the anti-Spartan League and the origin of the Corinthian War. He differs in several respects (G. and H. p. 232).

Col. XVI. 33 sq. = *Hell.* III. 4, 26-29 and IV. 1, 1-16. The autumn campaign of Agesilaus; P offers a simple and straightforward narrative and does not avoid the duller details. (G. and H. p. 239, 39 n.)

Col. XI. 1-34 (the overthrow of the Diagoreans at Rhodes) and xv. 37 (Conon's visit to Pharnabazus and Tithraustes); P gives information not found elsewhere.

APPENDIX VIII

The following are passages which exhibit close correspondence between Diodorus and Isocrates:

Diod. XI. 11, 1

Μᾶλλον εἶλοντο τελευτᾶν καλῶς
ἢ ζῆν αἰσχροῦς.

Isoc. *Paneg.* 95

τοῖς καλοῖς κάγαθοῖς αἰρετώ-
τερόν ἐστι καλῶς ἀποθανεῖν ἢ
ζῆν αἰσχροῦς.

Diod. XI. 11, 2

τῷ μεγέθει τῆς περιστάσεως
κατεσχημένοι τοῖς μὲν σώμασι
κατεπονθήθησαν ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς
οὐχ ἡττήθησαν.

Isoc. *Archidamos*, 9

τοῖς μὲν σώμασι κρατηθῆναι
τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν
ἀηττήτους ἔχειν. See also
Paneg. 92 and *Panath.* 187.

Diod. xv. 23, 5

οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι... φοβεροὶ
πᾶσιν ὑπῆρχον... διόπερ οἱ
μέγιστοι τῶν τότε δυναστῶν,
λέγω δὲ τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα
καὶ τὸν Σικελίας δυνάστην
Διονύσιον, ἐθεράπευον τὴν
Σπαρτιατῶν ἡγεμονίαν.

Isoc. *Paneg.* 125

Ἀμύντα δὲ τῷ Μακεδόνων
βασίλει καὶ Διονυσίῳ τῷ Σικελ-
ίας τυράννῳ καὶ τῷ βαρβάρῳ
τῷ τῆς Ἀσίας κρατοῦντι συμ-
πράττουσι (sc. οἱ Λακεδαι-
μόνιοι).

Ephorus took the same point of view:

F. 211

Διονύσιος ὁ Διονυσίου τοῦ τυράννου υἱὸς... συνθήκας ἐποιήσατο
πρὸς τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα ἵνα τῷ μὲν φαινομένῳ Λακεδαιμονίοις
βοηθῶν ἔλθῃ κατ' Ἀθηναίων, τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ πορθήσας τὴν
Ἑλλάδα...¹

The above are quoted from Volquardsen (*op. cit.* pp. 50-51).

¹ The scholiast is mistaken in attributing it to Dionysius II
(*F.G.H.* F. 211 n.).

THE HISTORIAN EPHORUS

Further passages which show considerable similarity of thought are:

Diod. XIII. 26, 3

οὔτοι γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ πρῶτοι τροφῆς ἡμέρου τοῖς Ἑλλησι μεταδόντες... οὔτοι νόμους εὔρον δι' οὓς ὁ κοινὸς βίος ἐκ τῆς ἀγρίας καὶ ἀδίκου ζωῆς εἰς ἡμέρον καὶ δικαίαν ἐλήλυθε συμβίωσιν. (Nicolaos, speaking of the Athenian prisoners at Syracuse.)

Diod. XI. 29, 3

καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων... οὐδὲν ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις ἑάσω... τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας. (Part of the oath taken by the Greeks before Plataea.)

Isoc. *Paneg.* 38-39

ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν μὲν ταύτην ἐποίησατο (Athens) τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, τροφὴν τοῖς δεομένοις εὑρεῖν... παραλαβοῦσα γὰρ τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἀνόμως ζῶντας... τούτων τῶν κακῶν αὐτοὺς ἀπήλλαξε... πρώτη γὰρ καὶ νόμους ἔθετο καὶ πολιτείας κατεστήσατο.

Isoc. *Paneg.* 156

τοὺς Ἴωνας ἄξιον ἐπαινεῖν, ὅτι τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων ἱερῶν ἐπηράσαντ' εἰ τινες κινήσειαν... ἴν' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις ᾗ τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας.

Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* II. p. 622 sq., also notices similarity in numbers. Both Diod. (XI. 3, 7) and Isoc. (*Paneg.* 93, 118) count Xerxes' navy as 1200 ships (but cf. Herod. VII. 89 and Aeschylus, *Persae*, 341 sq., who give 1207): at Thermopylae there were 1000 Lacedaemonians and 300 Spartans (XI. 4, 5; *Paneg.* 90). But this evidence cannot be conclusive.

APPENDIX IX

The following incidents in the War give some indication of Ephorus' Athenian sympathies:

(1) Diod. xii. 30. Thuc. i. 27-28. Diodorus' brevity suggests that the Corcyreans were anxious to effect a peaceful settlement: the implication in Thucydides is that they only thought of this when they found how much the Corinthians were arming.

(2) Diod. xii. 41. Thuc. ii. 5. The Plataeans, according to Diodorus, gave back their Theban prisoners, whereas Thucydides correctly says that they killed them contrary to their oath.

(3) Diod. xii. 69-70. Thuc. iv. 91. Diodorus does, on this occasion, acknowledge the prowess of the Thebans and their striking victory. All the same, he allows the Athenian cavalry to beat the Boeotian—a detail not in Thucydides.

(4) Diod. xii. 74. Thuc. v. 6 sq. According to the first account the battle was indecisive until Cleon and Brasidas had fallen: only then did the Spartans begin to win their victory. In Thucydides, the Athenian left wing was thrown into confusion at once and fled, the right wing held its own for some time, but was eventually routed.

(5) See also for slight exaggeration Diod. xii. 81 and Thuc. vi. 7.

APPENDIX X

Ephorus' calculation of the strength of the Persian and Greek armies is consistently exaggerated. As far as the Persians are concerned he appears to have relied on a traditional estimate which was made to serve for most occasions. Thus for the Egyptian Expedition in 456 (xi. 74, 1 and 75, 2), the campaigns against Cimon (xii. 3, 2) and Evagoras (xv. 2, 1), and the war with Egypt in 351 (xvi. 40, 6), the numbers of the Persians are estimated at 300,000 men and 300 ships. Pharnabazus also sent 300 ships to help the Spartans in 412 (xiii. 36, 5). There can be little doubt that Ephorus is giving the conventional account of the total strength of the Persian military and naval forces, in which, with the exception of the cavalry, the army was divided into thirty divisions under myriarchs.¹

Exceptions to the above rule are as follows:

- xi. 3, 7: Xerxes led 800,000 men into Greece.
- xi. 19, 5: Mardonius wintered in Greece with 400,000.
- xi. 30, 1: at Plataea there were 500,000 Persians.
- xi. 34, 3: at Mycale the Persians amounted to 100,000.
- xiv. 22, 2: at the battle of Cunaxa Artaxerxes had 400,000.
- xv. 41, 3: Artaxerxes sent 200,000 against Egypt in 374.

It is evident that Ephorus was not following Herodotus; but, except for the total of Xerxes' whole army, he does not improve on the latter's account. For instance Herodotus reckons the Persian force at 350,000 for Plataea (ix. 32) and 60,000 for Mycale (ix. 96). Ctesias seems to have been Ephorus' authority for the calculation of 800,000 at the opening of Xerxes' campaign (cf. Ctesias, *Pers.* 23); it is therefore surprising that, after reducing the impossible

¹ V. How and Wells' *Commentary on Herodotus*, i. pp. 366-367.

APPENDICES

figures given by Herodotus on this occasion, his totals for later events are larger. Yet at the battle of Cunaxa, where Ctesias was again Ephorus' source (*v. p.* 126), Xenophon's reckoning of the Persian forces (900,000) is more than halved, although Ephorus' computation is still considerably more than it should be.

In his estimate of the Greek forces it appears to have been a matter of indifference whether their numbers were stated or not. Amongst other examples may be mentioned the battles of Tanagra, Oenophyta, Amphipolis and Leuctra. Sometimes the totals are clearly greater than they really were: at Mantinea the Theban and Spartan armies are given as 30,000 and 20,000 respectively: at Plataea there were 100,000 Greek troops: and at the battle of Delium the reckoning of the Boeotians at 20,000 and the Athenians at a "considerably larger number" shows an increase of 3000 on Thucydides' account.¹ Clearly no reliance can be placed on Ephorus' calculations, although they are little worse than the vague general statements which characterised fifth- and fourth-century writers.²

¹ Cf. Diod. xii. 69, 3-4 with Thuc. iv. 93, 4-94, 1.

² V. A. W. Gomme, *Population of Athens*, pp. 3-4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TEXTS

- BILABEL. *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*, nos. 2 and 3. 1922.
DIODORUS SICULUS. Ed. F. Vogel. Teubner, 1890.
GRENFELL and HUNT. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XIII. 1919.
JACOBY, F. J. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 1923; II a and II c. 1926.
MILNE, J. G. *Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, nos. 109, III, II4. 1927.

BOOKS OF GENERAL REFERENCE

- BLASS, F. *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, II. pp. 396-410. 1874.
BURY, J. B. *Ancient Greek Historians*, pp. 162-165. 1909.
BUSOLT, G. *Griechische Geschichte*.
CHRIST, W. VON. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, vols. I, II.
CROISSET, A. and M. *Histoire de la Littérature grecque*, IV. pp. 655-662.
GERCKE und NORDEN. *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, III. p. 106. 1927.
PAULY-WISSOWA. *Real-Encyclopädie*, Arts. "Diodorus", "Ephorus", E. Schwartz.
WACHSMUTH, C. *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, pp. 498-506. 1895.
WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON. *Greek Historical Writing*. 1912.

PARTICULAR WORKS

- BAUER, J. *Die Benutzung Herodots durch Ephoros bei Diodor*. 1879.
BRUCHMANN, C. F. H. "Beiträge z. Ephorus-Kritik. I and II." *Progr. des K. König-Wilhelms-Gymnasiums z. Breslau*. 1889 and 1892.
BUSOLT, G. "Aristoteles oder Xenophon." *Hermes*, XXXIII. p. 71. 1898.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CAVAIGNAC, E. "Réflexions sur Ephore." *Mélanges Glotz*, I. 1932.
- DOPP, E. "Die geographischen Studien des Ephorus. I and II." *Wissensch. Beilage zum Jahresbericht d. Gymn. z. Rostock*. 1900 and 1908.
- DRESSLER. "Das Geschichtswerk d. Ephorus nach seinen Fragmenten u. seiner Benutzung durch Diodor." *Progr. d. Gymn. z. Bautzen*. 1873.
- HOLZAPFEL, L. *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. bei Ephorus*. 1879.
- KAERST, J. *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I. p. 149 sq.
- KAHRSTEDT, U. *Forschungen zur Gesch. d. ausgehenden fünften u. vierten Jahrhunderts*, p. 27 sq. 1910.
- KALISCHEK, A. E. *De Ephoro et Theopompo Isocratis Discipulis*. Diss. 1913.
- KLÜGMANN, J. A. *De Ephoro historico Graeco*. Diss. 1860.
- LAQUEUR, R. "Die Proömien", p. 161 and "Die Disposition", p. 321. *Hermes*, XLVI. 1911.
- MELBER, J. "Über d. Quellen u. d. Wert d. Strategemensammlung Polyäns." *Jahrb. f. Philologie*, Suppl. Bd. XIV. 1885.
- MESS, A. VON. "Untersuchungen über Ephoros." *Rhein. Mus.* LXI. pp. 360-407. 1906.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. *Filippo il Macedone*, p. 193 sq. 1934.
- NIESE, B. "Wann hat Ephorus sein Geschichtswerk geschrieben?" *Hermes*, XLIV. p. 170. 1909.
- SCHWARTZ, E. "Die Zeit des Ephorus." *Hermes*, XLIV, p. 481. 1909.
- "Kallisthenes' Hellenika." *Hermes*, XXXV. p. 112. 1900.
- "Timaeos' Geschichtswerk." *Hermes*, XXXIV. p. 485 sq. 1899.
- STELKENS. *De Ephori fide et auctoritate*. Diss. 1857.
- VOGEL. "Ephoros u. Diodor über d. Ausbruch d. peloponnesischen Kriegs." *Rhein. Mus.* XLIV. p. 523. 1899.
- VOLQUARDSSEN, C. A. *Untersuchungen über d. Quellen d. griech. u. sicil. Gesch. bei Diodor XI-XVI*. 1868.
- WOLFFGARTEN, H. *De Ephori et Dinonis Historiis a Trogo Pompeio expressis*. Diss. 1868.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

- BUSOLT, G. "Der neue Historiker und Xenophon." *Hermes*, XLIII. p. 255. 1908.
- GRENFELL and HUNT. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v. 1908.
- JACOBY, F. J. "Der Verfasser d. Hellenika von Oxyrhynchos." *Nachr. v. d. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. z. Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, I. 1924.
- JUDEICH, W. "Theopomps Hellenika." *Rhein. Mus.* LXVI. p. 94. 1911.
- LAQUEUR, R. P.W. "Theopompus", col. 2193 sq. 1934.
- MEYER, E. *Theopomps Hellenika*. 1909.
- UNDERHILL, G. E. "Theopompus' (or Cratippus') Hellenika." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXVIII. p. 277. 1908.
- WALKER, E. M. *Klio*, VIII. p. 356. 1908.
- *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. 1913.
- "The Oxyrhynchus Historian"; in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, J. U. Powell and E. A. Barber, p. 124. 1921.

